BIBLIOTHECA
FF. PRÆDICATORUM
CONVENTUS
CIVIT. BENITIÆ
Lit. 363
Pl.

1.00
mt

THE ORANGE SOCIETY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/orangesociety0000revh

THE ORANGE SOCIETY

BY THE

REV. H. W. CLEARY

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

LONDON
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.
1899

Reprinted from plates of the Tenth Australian Edition, 1897.

Preface to the First Edition.

For several years past a distinctively forward movement has been manifest among the Orange lodges in the colony of Victoria. Certain phases of this movement—such as, for instance, the attitude of the brethren towards the Party Processions Act, the undisguised spread of the association in practically every Department of the State, and the increased bitterness and publicity of their attacks on a large section of their fellow-citizens—have had the effect of focussing public attention more closely on the society than, perhaps, at any previous period of its local history since 1846. The interest in the proceedings of the lodges received a notable fillip through the publication of certain matters which were brought to light during the sittings of the Melbourne Post Office Inquiry Board in 1896. The main features of the evidence in point —which go to indicate a menacing condition of things for one portion of the population of the colony—are given as follow in the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Board[1]:

A letter, penned some eighteen months previously, in the handwriting of a line-repairer named William Taylor, had fallen into the hands of the Departmental police.[2] It charged a trustworthy[3] public servant, cable-jointer James Sullivan (a Catholic), with having stolen a quantity of kauri pine, the property of the Department.[4] The letter was produced at the Board's sitting of July 1, 1896.[5] Its appearance in the *Age* report of the following morning was the first intimation received by Sullivan regarding the charges which had been made against him.[6] At the opening of the sitting of the same day, Mr. Maxwell, who appeared to assist the Board, brought forward, with the sanction of its members, the evidence of James Sullivan and two others to show that the statements contained in the letter were wholly devoid of foundation.[7]

[1] The official Minutes are now (fourth edition) substituted for the *Age* report, which appeared in previous editions.
[2] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 845.
[3] *Ibid.*, Q. 591.
[4] *Ibid.*, Qq. 827 *sqq.*
[5] *Ibid.*, Qq. 595-596, 605.
[6] *Ibid.*, Q. 836.
[7] *Ibid.*, Qq. 826 *sqq.*

Departmental Detective White (a Protestant witness) testified that he had investigated the charge, and had failed to find a scrap of evidence to support it.[8]

The history of the letter was next told by line-repairer William Taylor, who was examined by Mr. Maxwell.

"852. Do you know to whom you sent this letter?—I did not send it to anybody that I am aware of. I copied it for another party who had written it. He thought I was a better writer than he, so got me to copy it." He named a fellow-employé who lived near him, and who, said the witness, "asked me to come into his house" and "to write this out for him."[9]

"855. Was it to injure cable-jointer Sullivan?—He said he was going to take it to the Worshipful the Master of the Orange lodge, to see if they could not fix up Sullivan, *as he was a Catholic*. I may mention at that time I was an Orangeman myself. L——[naming the person referred to in Q. 852] induced me to join; and I thought at the time, by the way he laid it before me, it was a chance to bring Protestanism forward. *I soon found out it was only to keep down Catholics.*"

The witness then mentioned the name of a public official, Mr. McLeod, "Worshipful Master" of the Queen's Own lodge,[10] Melbourne, and expressed his belief that the letter in question had come into his possession. At the time he copied the letter, the witness believed the statements contained in it; but, said he, "to the best of my belief at the present time, that which was done and said there in respect to Sullivan was unfounded, because I have found that other statements regarding Sullivan were untrue."[11]

He added that a considerable number of Orangemen in his Branch—several of whom he named—had made statements prejudicial to their Catholic fellow-employés.[12]

Further light was thrown upon the letter against James Sullivan by the unwillingly made admissions of another Orange witness, and still more by his frequent and mysterious lapses of memory and his tell-tale disinclination or downright refusal to give any evidence regarding lodge proceedings touching the charges mentioned above. Apart from its bearing on the case at issue, his conduct under examination is interesting for two reasons: (*a*) because it furnishes evidence of the iron grip in

[8] *Ibid.*, Qq. 845-849.
[9] *Ibid.*, and Q. 853.
[10] The Queen's Own lodge is understood to be composed altogether of Public Servants. In a speech reported in the *Victorian Standard*, in 1896, its chaplain claimed that it is the largest Orange lodge in the world
[11] *Ibid.*, Q. 860.
[12] *Ibid.*, Qq. 861-874, 891.

which Orangemen are held by their oath or solemn protestation of secrecy; (*b*) because our witness's hedging, memory-paralysis, and defiance of the Board of Inquiry, are thoroughly typical of the attitude of "loyal" Orangemen all over the world when questioned as to the "proceedings of the brethren in lodge assembled." The following extracts are from the Blue Book containing the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Board on July 2, 1896. The witness was examined by Mr. Maxwell:

"1121. Are you an Orangeman?—Am I what? I don't think that is a proper question to ask . . .

"1164. Were you never up before the Worshipful Master at an Orange lodge in connection with the matters referred to in that letter?—I don't think I should be asked such a question. It is foreign to the subject altogether.

"1165. It has been ruled by the Board that this is a very important matter, and the questions must be answered?—I did not see in the press that cable-jointer Sullivan was asked if he were an Orangeman.

"1165A. *The Chairman.*—You must answer the question, please.

"1166. *By Mr. Maxwell.*—Were you up before the Worshipful Master of any Orange lodge in reference to the matters referred to in this letter?—[*Witness did not answer.*]

"1167. *By the Board.*—You are not ashamed of being an Orangeman?—Of course not.

"1168. *By Mr. Maxwell.*—I suppose there is nothing to be ashamed of in connection with anything done in the lodge in reference to that letter?—[*Witness did not answer.*]

"1169. Please answer my question before I ask the Board to deal with you. Have you ever been up before the Worshipful Master of any Orange lodge in connection with that letter?—*I have attended a meeting of the lodge when subjects of that nature were brought before them.*

"1170. That is not my question. Were you ever up before the Worshipful Master of any Orange lodge when the specific matters mentioned in this letter were under discussion, and received consideration?—I cannot bring that to memory.

"1171. Then why did you take so long to answer?—[*Witness did not answer.*]

After some further distressing lapses of memory, the witness was asked:

"1176. Will you swear that you never were at a meeting presided over by Mr. McLeod when this letter received consideration?—I cannot bring it to memory.

"1177. Well, read it again—[*Witness did so*]—Now, did

you ever hear the matters referred to in this letter before?—What? The persons referred to? . . .

"1181. What do you mean when you stated that you had been at a meeting when subjects of this nature came up; what do you refer to?—*There are lots of matters that came up that I would not tell you or anybody else here about.* . . .

"1183. I want to know still what you meant when you stated you have been at meetings when subjects of a similar character have been under consideration?—I cannot bring them to memory just now.

"1184. Did you ever hear that such charges had been made against cable-jointer Sullivan?—I cannot go into that. . . .

"1187. Is Sullivan a friend of yours?—No, I would not like him to be a friend of mine. . . .

"1196. Did you ever hear of the existence of this letter before you saw it in the *Age* yesterday?—I cannot remember that.

"1197. Well, will you take a little time to think over it?—[*After hesitation*]—I cannot remember.

"1198. Will you try again?—No, I cannot remember."

The witness's memory gave way with equal hopelessness over several further questions on the same subject. Mr. Maxwell continued:

"1204. That won't do. I want an answer to my question?—[*Witness did not answer.*]

"1205. *The Chairman.*—You must not trifle with the Board in this manner. You must answer the question at once. Yes or no. [*Witness did not answer*]."

His memory continued to fail with dismal regularity through a number of succeeding questions.

"1214. *By the Board.*—But you have been at a meeting when these matters were referred to, and forgotten the circumstances?—It would be possible, I suppose.

"1215. *By Mr. Maxwell.*—Do you consider that the charges made against Sullivan in this matter were of a most serious character?—Yes.

"1216. Then do you think if these matters had been brought before the lodge you would be likely to forget the fact, especially considering they had reference to your Department?—It is likely I might forget."

His memory was eclipsed through several questions that followed.

"1224. Then you swear you had nothing to do with the formulating of these charges against Sullivan?—I don't remember anything about that.

"1225. Will you swear that you did not?—I could not say anything about it. . . .

"1229. [*By Mr. Mackey*].[13]—Now, in answer to my learned friend, you state that some similar matters to that letter have been considered in the ordinary course of lodge proceedings, so that you may have forgotten this particular one?—I think they did. I don't recollect that one. . . .

"*The Chairman.*—The Board wishes to give its opinion on your conduct and demeanour in giving your evidence here to-day. It was most unsatisfactory, and you have done yourself and any friends you wish to protect, a great deal of harm. You have not answered the questions directly or straightforwardly, and it is most unsatisfactory."

No denial or disclaimer of this evidence has, up to the date of this publication, appeared in the Melbourne daily press from the officers or other members of the lodge referred to. No reference has been made to the matter in the official *Report* of the Post Office Inquiry Board, presented to both Houses of Parliament, December 11, 1896. No action in regard to the statements elicited has been taken by the Crown law authorities. The incident is apparently closed. The apathy of Government in the matter has increased the sense of insecurity which Catholic officials and *employés* in every Department of the State had already felt by reason of such secret attacks as, according to the evidence of one of the witnesses, have been repeatedly levelled against James Sullivan and others of his fellow-workers in the Post and Telegraph Service of the colony.

The publication of the evidence elicited by the Post Office Inquiry Board led to the appearance of portions of some of the following chapters in the columns of the Melbourne *Advocate* of July 10, 1896, and following dates. It has been deemed desirable to place the facts therein contained in a form more permanent, and more convenient for reference, than could be furnished by the fleeting columns of a newspaper. Hence the appearance of this volume. Some seven new chapters have been written, while those which had already appeared have been greatly enlarged by the addition of a considerable amount of matter which could not find room even in the generous space placed at the writer's disposal by the editor of the *Advocate*. The arrangement of the subjects dealt with has involved a few repetitions of statement, which the critical eye will duly notice. Circumstances beyond the writer's control—including the difficulty of procuring certain current lodge

[13] Mr. Mackey appeared at the Inquiry for the Officers of the Engineering and Electrical Branch.

documents, etc. — have delayed the appearance of these chapters in book-form. They are now placed before the public in the hope that they may supply, in handy form, and as far as they go, reliable information as to the aims, methods, and tendency of a little-known, but active, secret society, which has kept a portion of the North of Ireland in a state of unhealthy ferment for over a century, and which, for the past few years, has been executing a forward movement in our midst. The reader will perceive that the overwhelming majority of the statements made in this volume regarding the Orange society are drawn from the *Reports* of Parliamentary Committees, Royal Commissions, and other forms of official inquiry, from the documents of Orange lodges and the utterances of the Orange press and platform, and from the works of Protestant writers of undoubted eminence.

H.W.C.

March 1, 1897.

Preface to the Fourth Edition.

THE favourable reception accorded to previous editions of this book, and the continued demand for copies of it, have led to the publication of the present issue. Several typographical and other minor errors, which were inadvertently passed over in previous editions, have been corrected. The book has been revised throughout, and enlarged by the addition of some forty pages of useful matter bearing on the Orange question, which, as had been anticipated, has already begun to assume a somewhat unpleasant aspect in more than one of the Australian colonies. Since the lines on Orangeism in the police force (pp. 323-324) went through the press, incidents have occurred, arising out of disturbances at the Brunswick L.O.L. procession, which are strongly calculated to increase the growing distrust of Catholics in the administration of justice in this colony. With a view to testing their credibility, counsel for the defence asked several policemen—Crown witnesses—if they were Orangemen. The question was strongly objected to by Counsel acting on behalf of the Crown, by the Police Inspector, and a majority of the bench.[1] Reference to the *Reports* of the various Royal Commissions of inquiry into the riots in Ulster, and to proceedings before Supreme Court judges in the same province, will show that this question has been repeatedly put, both to police and civilian witnesses, as a matter of course, and without the slightest demur or protest, in prosecutions arising out of sectarian disturbances; moreover, an affirmative reply is understood to indicate a strength of bias which seriously impairs the credibility of a witness. The reader is referred to the evidence of strong sectarian bias displayed in party cases by Orange police in Belfast; to the regulation forbidding the members of the force in Ireland from joining the association;[2] to the notoriously crooked ways of Orange witnesses;[3] and to the stern and

[1] *Herald*, July 26 and 28, 1897; *Argus* and *Age* of following days.

[2] Pp. 323-324. By the *Regulations*, Victorian policemen, before being received into the force, are required to state whether they belong to any secret society, and if so, to what one.

[3] See Preface, pp. 39-40, 46-47, 108, 110 *sqq.*, 115, 123-124, 247-248, 321, 323-324, 385.

vigorous condemnation of the methods by which the founts of justice are habitually poisoned by Orange magistrates[4] and jurymen.[5] The ways of justice in the Orange portions of Ulster have, for over a century, been a scandal to the country, and the despair of honest administrations; but I have yet to learn that police-witnesses in that woful corner of the most distressful country were ever protected, either by Crown officials or the bench, from being compelled to answer a question which, as the pages of this book will show, has, unhappily, only too decided a bearing on their credibility in party cases. It will be news to many of my readers to learn that, contrary to law and fact, the Orange association was officially recognised as a Friendly Society by a Minister of the present Victorian Cabinet.

I take this opportunity of thanking the Rev. E. C. Daly for several useful suggestions, and both the Catholic and the non-Catholic press of several of the colonies for their friendly notices of the work. I desire, in particular, to gratefully acknowledge the valuable services so freely and wholeheartedly rendered me, from first to last, in connection with this book, by the Rev. P. O'Doherty, M.R.I.A.

H.W.C.

August 1, 1897.

Preface to the Seventh Edition.

In preparing the seventh edition for the press, I have corrected several errata, and appended many additional references to the footnotes, chiefly from the *Reports* of the Parliamentary Committees of 1835.

H.W.C.

September 5, 1897.

[4]See pp. 34, 40-41, 43, 44 (*note*), 73, 75, 77, 178, 208, 224, 225 (and *note*), 249, 256, 260 (*note*), 265, 309, 311 (*note*), 312-314, 322-323, 325, 328, 333-334, 335-337, 345-347, 385.

[5]See pp. 256, 304-305, 310, 317, 319, 320, 321, 322, 326-327, 329, 330-332, 345-347, 385.

Contents.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION . . . v.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION . . . xi.

PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION . . . xii.

CHAPTER I. Introductory: A Brief Excursion through Orangeism—Bre'r Rabbit's Advice: When to "Lay Low" and when to Strike—Parliament and the Society: Some Embarrassing Attentions—An Orange Question and what it leads to—Why do we know so little of the Society?—A Governor-General gives a bit of his Mind. . . 1

CHAPTER II. State of Parties at the Rise of Orangeism—A Union of Hearts: Growth of Religious Toleration—The Rift in the Lute: An Ancient Village Feud, and what came of it 16

CHAPTER III. The Battle of the Diamond—How the new Sign-board was set up—A Question of Veracity: Rival Witnesses and a Tangled Tale—"The Great Day": "It was a Famous Victory"—What the British Parliament thought of it—The First Orange Lodge . . 36

CHAPTER IV. Peep-o'-Day Boys, *alias* Orangemen—An Oath of Blood—The Inaugural Revelry of the Lodges: "Sword, Fire and Faggot: Will Thresham and John Thrustout"—The Roll Call—The Charter Toast 57

CHAPTER V. Membership: Its Limitations—"No Papist Need Apply"—The Queen, the Ritualists, and other "Wishy-Washy," "Shilly-Shally," "Namby-Pamby" Protestants—A Marriage-law of the Lodges—Who are Eligible? . 83

CHAPTER VI. Wheels within Wheels—How the Secret is Guarded: Oaths, Tests, Signs, and Passwords—A Message from the King—Orangemen in the Witness-box and at the Bar of the House: Lodge Law *v.* Civil Law . 105

CHAPTER VII. Organisation of the Orange Society: The Ruling Caste; the Subject Caste; the Inner Circle and its Ways—The Grand Lodge "Maintains its Authority"—How the Brethren "Make their Influence Felt": Rules for Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—The Autocrat of the Lodges and the Polling-booth 126

CHAPTER VIII. Orange Demonstrations: Fine Phrases Appraised—The Oratorical Carnival: A few Whiffs from Billingsgate—The Secret out: Catholics and the Public Service—The Scarlet Woman and the Grand Old Enemy—Cain and Abel, and the People who wear Horns . 143

CHAPTER IX. Looking Backward: Orange Demonstrations viewed through Green Glasses—The Violated Treaty—The Penal Code: Striking the Shepherds; Dispersing the Flock—A Williamite Marriage Law—Beggary by Act of Parliament—"A Great System of Bribery"—"The Ignorant Irish" . 170

CHAPTER X. Orange Demonstrations: The Theatrical Display and its Methods—Roving Agitators: Their Words and their Ways

—What does "Loyalty" mean?—The March Past: Guns, Bayonets, "Sackfuls of Revolvers," Broken Heads, and other Valuable Property—Sniffing the Odour of Battle . . . 193

CHAPTER XI. Orange Demonstrations: The Forces Marshalled and getting to Work—Party Tunes, Party Cries and Emblems, and the Big, Big Drum—An Orange Holiday: How the Brethren do their Merrymaking in Ulster—Who Pays the Reckoning?—Some Forms of Opposition . . 212

CHAPTER XII. The Loyalty of the Orange Society—Clearing the Ground: A Definition of Terms—Official Professions and Official Practice: Five "Obligations" of an Orangeman—How the Brethren Aid the Civil Authorities—What "A Slight Exuberance of Loyalty" means—Loyalty in the Market: Its Selling Price 241

CHAPTER XIII. Loyalty of the Orange Society—Orange Soldiery: "The Gallant Orange Yeomanry"—Martial Law, Free-quarters, and other "Well-timed Measures"—The Gentle Sex: Loyalists *v.* Rebel Gallantry—The Orange Inquisition and its Ways—How Rebels were Made—The Reign of Terror; the Reign of Law; the Reign of Peace . 257

CHAPTER XIV. Loyalty of the Orange Society: Orange Magistrates and Jurors—Bench, Bar, and Parliament Speak—"Poisoning the Founts of Justice": "The Law an Instrument of Tyranny"—"Reform the Magistracy of Ireland, my Lord"—An Ulster Endemic: A Crop of Cases and a Prescription . . 309

CHAPTER XV. Loyalty in the Supreme Council of the Orange Institution—The Grand Lodge, the Party Processions Acts, and the Courts of Justice—Corrupting the Loyalty of the Army—How the Act of Suppression Worked — The Cumberland Conspiracy . . 340

APPENDIX A. The Position of Catholics in Belfast, Derry, and Armagh—The Position of Protestants in the South and West of Ireland 386

APPENDIX B. Ritual of Introduction to the Orange Degree: Introductory Remarks . 399

APPENDIX C. Rules of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria 408

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES 422

GENERAL INDEX 428

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES 458

ERRATA 459

THE

ORANGE SOCIETY.

Chapter I.

INTRODUCTORY: A BRIEF EXCURSION THROUGH ORANGEISM—BRE'R RABBIT'S ADVICE: WHEN TO "LAY LOW" AND WHEN TO STRIKE — PARLIAMENT AND THE SOCIETY: SOME EMBARRASSING ATTENTIONS—AN ORANGE QUESTION AND WHAT IT LEADS TO—WHY DO WE KNOW SO LITTLE OF THE SOCIETY?—A GOVERNOR-GENERAL GIVES A BIT OF HIS MIND.

"COULD his Majesty, King William [of Orange] learn in the other world that he has been the cause of more broken heads and drunken men since his departure than all his predecessors, he must be the proudest ghost and most conceited skeleton that ever entered the gardens of Elysium." Thus wrote an Orangeman, Sir Jonah Barrington,[1] in his *Personal Sketches*. The quoted passage applies to the breaches of the peace and the general confusion which have been, ever since 1796, the ordinary accompaniment of the typical Orange celebration of the Williamite victories in Ireland. Since its rise, in 1795, the Orange society has left its impress on the history of Ireland: not indeed a broad track on the course of her story,

[1] Sir Jonah Barrington was, early in 1798, a member of Lodge No. 176 (Dublin). *Minutes of Evidence*, Parliamentary Select Committee (Irish) of 1835, on Orange Lodges, Q. 9522.

but rather the mark of one who works deeply in a narrow groove. The association presents many features of interest: in its curious blending of politics and religion, in its early rise and progress, its varying fortunes, its plan of organisation, its aims, and its modes of activity. A study of these last affords an insight into what is, in some respects, a unique phase in the known working of secret organisations.

There is one clear note in its special religious programme: strenuous resistance to the Church of Rome. The rest, as we shall see in the fifth and following chapters, is vague or intangible (as where it speaks of supporting "the" Protestant religion); or it is frankly abandoned, or not insisted on. The English Parliamentary Select Committee, appointed in 1835 to inquire into the Orange society, said in their *Report*: "Your Committee find that the Orange lodges have a decidedly political character, and that almost all their proceedings have had some political object in view." In the course of these pages the reader will see that the brethren have been, throughout the course of Orange history, almost universally opposed to all broad-minded and progressive legislation in the direction of popular rights, such as Catholic Emancipation, Parliamentary Reform, the Irish Education Act, the extension of the franchise, etc. On one subject associated with politics, the rules and ritual of the institution are of quite a Draconian character—namely, on the duty of the brethren to support the nominees of the Grand Master at Parliamentary and Municipal elections. Reference to the seventh chapter of this series will show that, on this subject, the law of the lodges has a note as uncompromising as the snap of a steel trap.

The Orange society furnishes an interesting illustration of what a movement from below may come to be when its programme fits in with the need of a powerful political party, determined, at all hazards, to maintain its star in the ascendent. The organisation arose in 1795, among a "rude and illiterate mob" in Armagh county.[2] Through the encouragement given to the association by Government during the Pitt administration,[3] it rapidly worked its way sideways and upwards until, in the course of time, it included in its motley ranks members of every stratum in society, from Tony Lumpkin to the royal Duke of Cumberland, brother of the reigning King, William IV. It was, in effect, an Association for the Revival and Perpetuation of Religious Animosities;

[2] *Chambers' Encyclopædia*, ed. 1865, art. "Orangemen." See chapter iv., *infra*.

[3] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 47; cf. vol. iii., pp. 131, 473; iv., 52, 55. See chapter xiii., *infra*.

it was strangely out of joint with the temper of the time; it successfully stemmed the tide of religious toleration that was coming in with a rush in the last quarter of the eighteenth century; and in two short but feverish years (1795-1796) it succeeded in altering, to a great extent, the subsequent course of Irish history.[4] On its fortieth anniversary, in 1835, it had a compact party in Parliament; had honey-combed the army and every department of the Civil Service; and had in its ranks considerably over a quarter of a million of armed civilians, all under the supreme and irresponsible control of its Imperial Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland.[5]

STRIKING THE FOE.

The Orange association possesses the keen sense which secret societies, generally, share with hunted animals: when its thews and sinews are young or flaccid, or when it is otherwise lacking in physical force (as in Australia), or when there is a scent of danger in the air, it follows the cautious advice of old Bre'r Rabbit: "Lay low and say nuffin'."[6] But in the days of its strength an opposite policy is pursued. For instance: referring to its Augustan era—1829-1835—the *Report* of the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 says that in the correspondence of the Imperial Grand Lodge, "there is a general reference to the advantage of increase of numbers, of boldness of attitude, and even of physical force, to support the views of the Orange institution." According to his own statement, Fairman was busy at the time working up among the brethren "such an attitude of boldness as will strike the foe [their political opponents] with awe,"[7] and "such a moral and physical force" as will "strike them with terror and sore dismay;"[8] while Deputy Grand Master Plunket, M.P., refers to "the physical strength of the Orange institution as its last resort."[9] In the pursuit of their "forward" policy, the brethren (as we shall see in detail in subsequent chapters) calmly and triumphantly defied magisterial and viceregal proclamations; overrode Acts of Parliament (such as the Party Processions

---

[4]Lecky, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., p. 446. See chapter ii., *infra.*

[5]*Report*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835.

[6]The action of a Melbourne lodge, as detailed in the preface of these chapters, is a case in point, as regards a unit of the society. An instance in which the whole society found it convenient to "lay low" will be found in chapter x., *infra*, *note* 17 and text.

[7]Deputy Grand Secretary Fairman's letter to the Duke of Gordon (Grand Master for Scotland), August 11, 1833, in *Report* of English Select Committee, Appendix.

[8]Fairman's Letter to Lord Longford, June, 1833, *ibid.*

[9]Letter to Fairman, July 5, 1834, *ibid.*

and Oaths Acts); withstood, with arms in their hands, the forces of the Crown; systematically, and on a vast scale, tampered with the loyalty of the nation's last resource—its army; and finally, as contemporary Protestant historians tell us, entered into a conspiracy to exclude the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, from the British throne, in favour of their Imperial Grand Master, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland. The menacing and seditious behaviour of the organisation led to the Parliamentary inquiries of 1835. The revelations then made as to the society's aims and methods of work aroused the alarm and indignation of the country; the public exposure shook the pillars of the Grand Imperial Institution of London, that had ruled the lodges of the world. English Orangeism fell like another temple of Dagon. Since that fateful year, the olden glories of the society have never returned. It has existed since then as a series of separate national associations, held together in a loose confederacy by an Imperial Grand Council, presided over by an Imperial Grand Master, who, I believe, is, or was, the Earl of Enniskillen. These national or colonial offshoots retain the same life-aims, the same organisation and methods of work, and (with slight modifications to meet local requirements) the same *Laws and Constitution.*

EMBARRASSING ATTENTIONS.

It has been the lot of the Orange society to attract, throughout the course of its history, the marked attention of the makers and administrators of the law—more so, perhaps, than any other association now existent. It was the subject of animated debates in the Irish House of Commons as early as 1796, when it was, so to speak, only an infant in arms—one year old. Its "forward" policy occupied the attention of the British House of Commons almost every year from 1813 to 1825, when it was suppressed by Act of Parliament. In 1836, the English lodges dissolved in anticipation of a similar Act. The society was, moreover, the sole or chief object of three Party Processions Acts (1832, 1850, 1860), and of divers Oaths and Tests Acts[10]; and its proceedings have furnished themes for question and debate in Parliament from its reorganisation in 1828 down to the present time. In Ulster, and in Canada, the celebration of its anniversaries is, as we shall see in the tenth and eleventh chapters, a standing menace to the public peace, and a constant source of anxiety to the Executive: in the Irish province these displays have cost the ratepayers as much money as would wipe out the public debt of an

[10] See chapters vi., x., xi., *infra.*

Australian colony. Ulster is the head-quarters of the Orange association; the west of Scotland is a good ally; Canada—and especially the province of Ontario—has the most active and energising of the colonial offshoots of the society; Australia is a land of promise. The first Australian lodge of which the present writer has any record was founded in Sydney, in defiance of the orders of the Commander-in-Chief, by one Corporal McKee, of the 17th regiment, in 1833.[11]

Each colony has long had its Grand Lodge, with its scattered groups of district and private lodges. The separate Orange organisations in each colony were from time to time and here and there moved in a halting and tentative way by the spirit of federation which swept over Australia. Some years ago the lodges of Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, were brought under the control of what is termed the Grand Council of Australasia.[12] The most recently formed, or one of the most recently formed, of the lodges of Victoria is numbered 169.[13] Western Australia claims sixteen lodges and about a thousand brethren. New South Wales is apparently looked up to by some of the fraternity as the Ulster of the group. The Royal Black Preceptory lodges are but the *penetralia* of the institution—the ordinary meeting places of the choice spirits who form the inner rings or "higher degrees" of the association. Akin to the Orange body is the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society. It also has for its organ the *Victorian Standard*, circulates among its members the same class of No-Popery literature, and joins hand in hand with the "Sons of William" in their annual demonstrations.[14]

---

[11] *Report* of Parliamentary Select Committee (English) of 1835, p. xv.

[12] The Grand Council assembles once in three years. Its last meeting was held in Melbourne, April 22, 1897, representatives being present from the Grand Lodges of the colonies mentioned above (*Victorian Standard*, April 30, 1897). The lodges of the colonies just referred to have a uniform system of secret signs and passwords, which are devised by the Grand Council at its triennial meetings (*Victorian Standard, ibid*). The New South Wales lodges may or may not have joined this confederacy, but according to Grand Secretary Baker of the Victorian institution, they have a separate and independent system of signs and passwords (*Victorian Standard*, November 30, 1897). Western Australia has a Grand Council of its own.

[13] *Victorian Standard*, May 31, 1897.

[14] Reference to the *Victorian Standard* of November 30, 1896, will show that the offices of this society are filled altogether, or almost altogether, by members of the Grand Orange Lodge of the colony. The Protestant Alliance Friendly Society may be looked upon as practically but a benefit branch of the Orange association.

AUSTRALIAN LODGES.

The Australian colonies have not, thus far, witnessed the full blossom and fruit of Orangeism, as displayed in Ulster and in Canada. This is not, however, due to any difference in principles of conduct—such does not exist: it is the result of fewer opportunities or smaller possibilities of activity. None the less, the society has contrived to produce, even in this portion of the Empire, acute forms of local irritation. Riots were narrowly averted in Melbourne on the twelfths of July, 1844 and 1845. On the Williamite anniversary of the following year, a number of armed Orangemen assembled in the Pastoral Hotel in that city, illegally hung out offensive party emblems, and, while the authorities were proceeding to remove the banners and arrest the brethren, fired through an open window a volley which wounded an inoffensive spectator named David Hurley, led to the death of a chance passer-by (Jeremiah Denworth), and narrowly missed taking the valued life of one of the most distinguished statesmen of the colony, Sir John (then Mr.) O'Shanassy. A similar public display of an offensive Orange emblem (a transparency) at the Melbourne Grand Lodge (the Protestant Hall) led to another disturbance, November 27, 1867, on the occasion of the visit of the Duke of Edinburgh to Victoria. In their joint narrative of the Duke's travels, his chaplain and Mr. Brierly write: "The exhibition of a design of such a decidedly party character had been generally condemned as likely to provoke the animosity of an opposite faction, and the authorities tried, but without success, to prevail upon the Orangemen not to exhibit it." The same writers go on to relate how, on the second night of the display, stones were thrown at the "obnoxious device," when "the people within the building immediately fired an indiscriminate volley in amongst the crowd. Two men and a poor boy were seriously wounded, and the boy eventually died from the effects of his wound. . . . Nothing can excuse the Orangemen for having, in the first instance, exhibited a party device, which they knew would provoke retaliation and lead to a breach of the peace."[15] Some of the proceedings of the Orange organisa-

[15]The *Cruise of H.M.S. Galatea*, by Rev. J. Milner and Oswald W. Brierly, p. 245-64. The *Advocate* of 15th August, 1896, contains the following: "Mr. Mansfield, of Geelong, has furnished us with the following reminiscence of an Orange outrage: 'Among the reminiscences of 12th July, 1846, I have never seen reference made to the death of Jeremiah Denworth, who was shot on that day. He arrived with me on 4th October, 1841. On the ill-fated 12th, when removing his furniture to a fresh tenement, he was struck by a bullet, near J. T. Smith's tavern. The ball glanced from the left hip, crossed the spine under the skin, and after a year or more found its way through the flesh on the inside of the right thigh, whence it was

tion in Victoria have from time to time been the subject of uncomplimentary mention in the Legislative Assembly, and it has furnished the occasion for the placing of the Party Processions Act among the statutes of the colony.[16] Its physical strength is not as yet sufficiently hard knit to exhibit the bold and triumphant defiance which Ulster Orangeism offers to Party Processions Acts. It has, nevertheless, both in Melbourne and the provinces, made repeated efforts to evade the provisions of the statute.

The Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria has taken another leaf out of the principles which prevail in Belfast and in the Mecca of Orangeism, Derry, where, with a population of 18,346 Catholics, and 14,860 Protestants, the former have been, almost to this hour, excluded from practically every office in the gift of the municipality. The reader will see at the proper time from the pages of their organ, the *Victorian Standard*, that certain Orange leaders have on sundry occasions given public expression to the opinion that Catholics, because of their religion, are unfitted for positions in the Public Service. An Orange lodge at Ballarat (with Deputy Grand Master Mr. Vale, M.L.A., in the chair) censured certain members "for conduct unworthy of Orangemen" in voting for the admission of Catholics to be members of the South Street Debating Society, even though their votes were given with a view to rendering the Society non-sectarian, and thus securing for it a Government grant. The following report of the proceedings appears in the not unfriendly columns of the Melbourne *Age* of September 13, 1890, under the heading, "Singular Display of Bigotry":

BALLARAT, Friday.

"The South Street Debating Society, the premier organisation of the kind in Ballarat, having resolved to admit Roman Catholics to their ranks, are now entitled to a share of the Government library or book vote. This share has already been apportioned at £50, and the amount is now on the list for payment to the board of management. But the rescinding of the rule has involved several young Orangemen in trouble with their lodge, No. 68, owing to their having countenanced or advocated the admission of all classes to the debating club. Among the offenders in this respect are Mr. W. D. Hill, secretary to the society, and Mr. F. Barrow. Both of these gentlemen are members of the L.O.L., No. 68, and on Tuesday night

extracted. He lingered in agony for three years. I frequently visited him at his house at the rear of the Adam and Eve Hotel."

[16] "That this Act is aimed at the Orange institution is a well-known fact." *Victorian Standard* (lodge organ), in leader, March 31, 1897.

they were cited to appear before a meeting of brethren at the City Fire Brigade Station to 'give an account of their stewardship.' Deputy Grand Master Bro. R. T. Vale presided, and there was a full muster of members of the institution. Bro. Hill, who is a fluent speaker, asked what charge had been preferred against him, and the reply was, that he had been *guilty of conduct unbecoming an Orangeman in assisting the 'encroachments' of the Roman Catholic Church by moving in the debating society for the excision of the rule limiting membership to Protestants.* Bro. Hill said he was not ashamed of the course of action he had taken, and he refused to apologise in any way for his conduct. But why should the Orangemen make, he said, a scapegoat of the South Street Debating Society? In the Australian Natives' Association, Orangemen and Roman Catholics mingled together, and the same might be said of the Masonic fraternity, into whose ranks men of all persuasions were admitted. Bro. Barrow also refused to retract from the stand he had taken in throwing open the South Street Debating Society to all classes. The chairman remarked that had the bar not been removed from the Roman Catholics the Government grant to the society would have been lost. *Finally the lodge censured Bros. Hill and Barrow for their action.* The former, before retiring from the lodge, said warmly that the Roman Catholic Church had been frequently charged with not allowing its members to exercise their own judgment, but the Orange lodge were now doing the very thing that they were decrying in others. If that were Orangeism, he had enough of it. . . . Messrs. Hill and Barrow have, since the meeting of the lodge, sent in their resignations as members of the Orange institution."[17]

The facts elicited at the Melbourne Post Office Inquiry of 1896, as reported in the *Argus* and the *Age* of July 3 (see preface), would go to show that (1) an admittedly false charge was made by certain brethren of a city lodge against a trustworthy public servant, James Sullivan, his only crime being that he was a Catholic; (2) that it was their intention to bring the matter before the Worshipful Master of the lodge (who holds a high position in the Public Service) with a view to "fix up" Sullivan; (3) that "subjects of this nature" were actually dealt with by the lodge.

These facts will surprise no one who has lived in Ulster, or is acquainted with the history of the Orange institution. They are but the bubbles that occasionally float to the surface from the dark depths of lodge secrecy, but they sufficiently

[17] The same facts are recorded in the *Ballarat Star* of the previous day (12th September, 1890), in which it is stated that "a vote of censure on Messrs. Hill and Barrow *was unanimously passed.*"

indicate the set of the Orange current. Those who know the history of such organisations are aware that they are frequently most determined and dangerous when apparently almost passive. We shall in due course refer to other reprehensible features in the rules and actions of the Australian association, which go to show that we are within measurable distance of the time when the public and the statesmen of these colonies will find themselves face to face with an Orange question. It has long since reached an acute stage in Canada. Charles Dickens (whose *Pictures of Italy* show the strength of his feeling against Catholics) thus refers, in his *American Notes*, to Toronto, the head-quarters of Canadian Orangeism :

"It is a matter of deep regret that political differences should have run high in this place, and led to most discreditable and disgraceful results. It is not long since guns were discharged from a window in this town at the successful candidates in an election, and the coachman of one of them was actually shot in the body, though not dangerously wounded. But one man was killed on the same occasion : and from the very window whence he received his death the very flag which shielded his murderer *(not only in the commission of his crime, but from its consequences)* was displayed again on the occasion of the public ceremony[18] performed by the Governor-General, to which I have just adverted. Of all the colors in the rainbow there is but one which could be so employed ; *I need not say that flag was Orange.*"

Chambers' Encyclopædia has the following : "Of the colonial off-shoots of the Orange association, those of Canada have at all times been the most active and the most flourishing. The Canadian Orangemen being, for the most part, Irish emigrants, carried with them all the bitterness of the domestic feuds with the Roman Catholics. Outrages directed against Catholic churches, convents, and other institutions, were of not unfrequent occurrence until recently." The years 1871 to 1878 witnessed a long series of riots and confusion in the Orange centres of the Dominion. With the exception of the year 1871, the Marquis of Dufferin (an Ulster Protestant) was Governor-General of Canada during the whole of this period of sectarian storm. On the 26th of September in the latter year, when retiring from his office, he received at Toronto an address from the "Irish Protestant Benevolent Society," which is, I believe, an association of Orangemen, corresponding with the "Protestant Alliance Friendly Society" of Victoria. In his reply, the distinguished statesman is reported

[18] The opening of a new college.

by the *New York Herald* of the following day to have spoken as follows:

THE TRAGEDY OF ORANGEISM.

"No one can have watched the recent course of events without having observed, almost with feelings of terror, the unaccountable exacerbation and recrudescence of those party feuds and religious animosities from which, for many a long day, we have been comparatively free. Now, gentlemen, this is a most serious matter. Its import cannot be exaggerated, and I would beseech you and every Canadian in the land who exercises any influence amid the circle of his acquaintance—nay, every Canadian woman, whether mother, wife, sister, or daughter—to strain every nerve, to exert every faculty they possess, to stifle and eradicate this hateful and abominable root of bitterness from amongst us. Gentlemen, I have had a terrible experience in these matters. I have seen one of the greatest and most prosperous towns of Ireland—the city of Belfast—hopelessly given over, for an entire week, into the hands of two contending religious factions. I have gone into the hospital and beheld the dead bodies of young men in the prime of life lying stark and cold upon the hospital floor; the delicate forms of innocent women writhing in agony upon the hospital beds, and every one of these struck down by an unknown bullet, fired by those with whom they had no personal quarrel, towards whom they felt no animosity, and from whom, had they encountered them in the intercourse of ordinary life, they would have probably received every mark of kindness and good-will. But where these tragedies occurred, senseless and wicked as were the occasions which produced them, there had long existed between the contending parties, traditions of animosity and ill-will, and the memory of ancient grievances. But what can be more Cain-like, more insane, than to import into this country, unsullied as it is by any evil record of civil strife—a stainless paradise, fresh and bright from the hands of its Maker, where all have been freely admitted upon equal terms—the bloodthirsty strife and brutal quarrels of the Old World? Divided as you are into various powerful religious communities, none of whom are entitled to claim either pre-eminence or ascendency over the other, but each of which reckons amongst its adherents enormous masses of the population, what hopes can you have except in mutual forbearance and a generous liberality of sentiment? Why, your very existence depends upon the disappearance of these ancient feuds. Be wise, therefore, in time, I say, while it is still time, for it is the property of these hateful quarrels to feed on their

own excesses. If once engendered, they widen their bloody circuit from year to year, till they engulf the entire community in internecine strife. Unhappily, it is not by legislation or statutory restrictions, or even by the interference of the armed Executive, that the evil can be effectually and radically remedied. Such alternatives, even when successful at the time (I am not alluding to anything that has taken place in Canada, but to my Irish experiences) are apt to leave a sense of injustice and of a partial administration of the law rankling in the minds of one or other of the parties. But, surely, when reinforced by such obvious considerations of self-preservation as those I have indicated, the public opinion of the community at large ought to be sufficient to repress the evils. Believe me, if you desire to avert an impending calamity, it is the duty of every human being amongst you, Protestant and Catholic, Orangeman and Union man, to consider, with regard to all these matters, what is the real duty they owe to God, their country, and each other. (Applause). And now, gentlemen, I have done. I trust that nothing I have said has wounded the susceptibilities of any of those who have listened to me. God knows I have had but one thought in addressing these observations to you, and that is to make the best use of this exceptional occasion, and to take the utmost advantage of the goodwill with which I know you regard me, in order to effect an object upon which your own happiness and the happiness of future generations so greatly depend."

In 1882, the five judges of the Supreme Court (*in re* Grant *v.* The Mayor of Montreal) declared that by virtue of cap. x., sec. 6, of the Consolidated Statutes of the Dominion of Canada, the Orange institution "is an illegal body, and its members may be prosecuted and found guilty of misdemeanour."[19] In the same year the Dominion Parliament rejected a bill to legalise the association.[20]

KNOW-NOTHINGISM UP TO DATE.

From Canada, Orangeism stole silently into the United States. Under the Stars and Stripes it has taken two forms: the Orange society proper (to which brief reference will be made in the sixth chapter); and the A.P.A., or American Protective Association, so-called, whose proceedings, especially in some of the Western states, bring back the memory of the crimes and follies of the Know-nothing organisations of 1853 and the following years. The well-known Protestant

[19] *Hist. of Orangeism*, by M.P., p. 297.
[20] Healy's *Word for Ireland*, p. 150.

journalist, Mr. W. T. Stead, thus refers to the A.P.A. in a recent work:

"Of all the folk-lore tales of Europe, the most horrible is that of the Vampire of the Levant. The vampire is the reanimated corpse of an evil doer, which is doomed to leave the tomb, and return to the living in order that, with livid lips, he shall draw in the life blood from the veins of his sleeping friends. The A.P.A., that strange association for the protection of American citizens, which seems to have within its ranks far more Canadians and Orangemen from Ulster and Glasgow than native-born citizens of the United States, always reminds one of the restless vampire of south-eastern Europe. No-Popery fanaticism died fifty years ago in England. We imagined it dead and buried. But here is the vampire thing making night hideous by re-visiting the pale glimpses of the moon in Western America. It is the same old demon, with its familiar hoof and horns and tail, scaring the old women of both sexes with the bogey of impending massacre, and of the domination of sixty millions by six. . . . . The anti-Catholic propaganda is chiefly the work of non-Americans, who, finding no field for the reception of their pernicious nonsense in Cardinal Manning's country [England], are endeavouring to palm off upon the New World the cast-off trumpery for which we have no more use on our side of the water."[21]

WHY DON'T WE KNOW?

It may at first sight appear singular that the Australian public should know so little of the aims and methods of a society which has its branches in every part of the colonies, and which figures so prominently before the world when each circling year brings its "glorious twelfth" around. The explanation is not far to seek. It lies partly in the difficulty of access to the standard sources of information on the subject, partly in the policy of secrecy pursued by the society itself.

1. The documents which turn a search-light into the secret recesses of the lodge are contained in sundry Blue Books, such as the voluminous *Reports* of the Parliamentary Committees appointed in 1835 to inquire into the origin and working of the Orange institution; the *Reports* of the several Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the sectarian riots of Belfast, Derry,

[21] *If Christ came to Chicago*, pp. 356-357. On p. 254 Mr. Stead says; "Most of their [the A.P.A.] members are not Americans but Canadians or Britons." Deputy Grand Master R. T. Vale (Victoria) correctly describes the A.P.A. as "a body based on very similar lines to the Orange institution" (*Victorian Standard*, November 30, 1896, p. 9.)

Portadown, and elsewhere, the *Journals* of the House of Commons; and a number of books that have a limited circulation among the masses of the reading public, such as the works of Plowden, Madden, Mitchel, Sir Jonah Barrington, Barry O'Brien, Lecky, Killen, "M.P.," divers histories, volumes of letters and speeches, etc. All of these will be freely drawn upon in the course of the following pages [22]

2. Again, in these colonies Orangeism has not as yet forced itself on public attention by becoming, to the same extent as it is in Ulster, a constant menace to the peace, a source of anxiety to the Executive, and of financial loss to the country. In our midst it is, happily, not yet strong enough in numbers or influence to indulge in those ready resorts to armed resistance to the law, and to intimidation at election times and during periods of political excitement, which, as we shall see in due course, continue to our day to be part of the settled policy of the leaders of the Irish Orange association. This favourite policy of organised physical force was justly regarded by the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 as one of the most menacing features of Orangeism, and one calling for its urgent suppression in the interests of public tranquility. In the fourth, tenth, eleventh, thirteenth, and fifteenth chapters, the reader will find abundant details of the various uses to which the physical strength of the lodges has been put from 1795 to the present day.

3. The popular unacquaintance with the inner workings of Orangeism is likewise fostered by a vital rule of the institution —the rule of secrecy. As in many other secret societies, this rule has a double action—(*a*) jealous concealment of lodge proceedings, documents, etc.; (*b*) the publication of what would be termed on the Mining Exchange cooked prospectuses.

(*a*) The sixth chapter deals with the rule of secrecy, detailing the extreme, frequently illegal, sometimes criminal, means employed to guard the proceedings of the society not alone from ordinary profane outsiders, but from courts of law, from Parliamentary Select Committees of Inquiry, and even from lodge members of a lower degree. This policy of secrecy—so vital to the lodges—forms the chief difficulty which a writer has to encounter in dealing with the proceedings of this curious politico-religious association.

In the Australian colonies, at least, this policy of secrecy is apparently extended, in effect, to even the public facts of Orange history. The writer of these chapters has read the

[22] See Index of Authorities at end of this volume.

reports of some hundreds of L.O.L. demonstrations, together with a great number of articles, etc., in the files of the *Victorian Standard*[23] extending over a period of some thirteen years. He cannot, however, recall a single instance in which Orange speakers or writers appealed to the records of Orange history in support of the claims advanced by them on behalf of their association. As far as they are concerned, the history of the Order begins and ends with the "glorious revolution of 1688," and the "glorious, pious, and immortal memory" of William, Prince of Orange. Inside the lodges, in their press and on their platform, the clock of time would seem to have stopped short at 1690.[24] No whisper, not a breath, of the Royal Commissions of 1857, 1864, 1869, 1883, 1886, etc. Few, even among the leaders and Press champions of colonial Orangeism, appear to have any idea of the evidence which in 1835 laid bare the secrets of the well "tyled" Grand Lodge, and felled the institution at the moment when its final triumph was at hand, and when, as distinguished Protestant historians maintain, the famous conspiracy was well nigh matured, which was to set aside the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, and to place upon the throne of England the Imperial Grand Master, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland.[25]

(b) I have indicated another contributing cause to the prevailing lack of knowledge of the ways of Orangemen, namely, their publication to the world, through press and platform, of what the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 termed a set of "ostensible purposes." These are chiefly contained in what are termed the "basis of the institution," and the "qualifications of an Orangeman." Significantly enough, these are the only portions of the Orange rules which are allowed to go before the public. They represent the Orange society as a sort of exalted Quakerism, and are accepted by many outside the lodges as the Nicene Creed of the institution. The patient reader who follows the course of this volume will have abundant opportunities of seeing in detail

---

[23]The *Victorian Standard*, in its issue of April 30, 1897, describes itself as "the accredited organ of the [Orange] institution in Victoria."

[24]A curious instance in point is furnished by *The Rise and Progress of Orangeism*, by one F. Morgan, who writes under the pen-name "Ulsterman." The book is dedicated to, and published "with the sanction and approval of," the Grand Master of Victoria. The *Rise and Progress of Orangeism*, of which the book professes to treat, are only lightly touched upon in some 11 of the 96 pages of which it is composed. The remainder of the publication is taken up with a bombastic account of the Williamite wars in Ireland, "padded out" with long extracts from the doggerel Orange rhymes of Robert Young ("Old True Blue.")

[25]See chapter xv., *infra*.

the hopeless incongruity of the century-old feud that exists between the public professions and the official practices of the Orange association.

The purpose of this volume is not to give a set history of the society, but to set before the reader certain broad features of the inner working and the outward action of Orangeism, which embrace the greater portion of its annals, and which best explain its true aims, methods and character. I purpose to deal briefly with

1. The rise of Orangeism;
2. Its methods of organisation;
3. Its demonstrations: their purpose, their methods, and their results;
4. Some of its leading professions; how far they are consistent, or at variance, with the facts of its history.

In the course of the following pages the sources of information referred to above will be freely drawn upon: namely, Government Blue Books and other official publications; the past and current rules, rituals, and proceedings of the Orange society, as far as they have been brought to the light of day; newspapers, tracts, pamphlets, etc., issued in the interest of the lodges—as far as they can be decently quoted; the utterances of statesmen, judges, historians, etc., the vast majority of whom are Protestants. In dealing with certain periods of Orange history, I have not, of course, excluded such valued standard Catholic authorities as Plowden, Madden, etc. The reader will, however, note that the verdict of statesmanship and of history on the Orange society comes chiefly from sources which do not lie open to the imputation of undue bias against the association.

Chapter II.

STATE OF PARTIES AT THE RISE OF ORANGEISM —A UNION OF HEARTS. GROWTH OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION — THE RIFT IN THE LUTE: AN ANCIENT VILLAGE FEUD, AND WHAT CAME OF IT.

"It must be admitted that the [Orange] system had a rather ominous beginning." So wrote the Ulster Presbyterian historian, the Rev. Dr. Killen.[1] The facts connected with the rise of the Orange Society may be briefly stated as follow:

1. The Orange society took its rise in a country where the Catholic body were singularly free from the stigma of having persecuted Protestants because of their religious convictions.

2. It arose at a time when the members of the State religion were more firmly and peacefully established in the government of the country than they had been at any time since the Reformation; when there existed a kindlier feeling between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland than at any subsequent period of their history; and when, of all times, there was least need of an association to "defend the Protestant religion" as by law established in the land.

3. The Orange society was founded in "the most Protestant county in Ireland," where the Catholics were a minority of the population, and in a province, too, where, as the venerable Presbyterian historian, Hill, in his *Plantation of Ulster*, shows the Catholics had been robbed of every inch of the land that belonged to themselves and their fathers.

4. Catholics at the time were as loyal as the members of any other religious denomination in the country.

5. The society took its rise in events which altogether exclude the idea that it was founded for the defence of religion, or the maintenance of the law.

6. Its rise was inaugurated by a fierce persecution of the Catholic body in Ulster. This persecution was carried out in

[1] *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 359. Dr. Killen was President of the Assembly's College, Belfast, and is held in high esteem as a historian by Irish Presbyterians. His evidence on the Orange society is all the more noteworthy when taken in connection with his strong prejudice against Catholics, which finds vigorous expression throughout the whole course of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

direct violation of civil law and natural right; it extended over a period of several years; and forms one of the blackest epochs in the history of the nation's suffering and woe.

NOT PERSECUTORS.

1. *Catholics and Protestants in Ireland.*—The Protestant historian, Lecky, says: "The Irish have not generally been an intolerant or persecuting people."[2] In another of his works[3] he writes: "It is open to anyone to maintain that the Irish Catholics would never have been content with any position short of ascendency; but whatever plausibility this theory may derive from the experience of other countries, there is no real evidence to support it in Irish history." Taylor (another Protestant writer) says in his *Irish Civil Wars*[4]: "It is but justice to the Catholics of Ireland to add, that on the three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand, they never injured a single person in life or limb for professing a religion different from their own. They had suffered persecution and learned mercy, as they showed in the reign of Mary, in the wars from 1641 to 1648, and during the brief triumphs of James II."

Writing of these three periods of the temporary triumph of the hitherto persecuted Irish Catholics, Lecky says: "It is a memorable fact that not a single Protestant suffered for his religion in Ireland during all the period of the Marian persecution in England. The treatment of Bedell during the savage outbreak of 1641, and the Act establishing liberty of conscience passed by the Irish Parliament in 1689,[5] in the full flush of the brief Catholic ascendency under James II., exhibit very remarkably this aspect of the Irish character, and it was displayed in another form scarcely less vividly during the Quaker missions, which began towards the close of the Commonwealth, and continued with little intermission for two generations." Two pages further on Lecky says: "The experience of Wesley half a century later was very similar. He has more than once in his 'Journal' spoken in terms of warm appreciation of the docile and tolerant spirit he almost everywhere encountered."[6]

---

[2] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, ed. 1871, p. 214.

[3] *Hist. of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 36.

[4] Vol. i., p. 168.

[5] Catholics were in an overwhelming majority in this Parliament. The Act ran: "We hereby decree that it is the law of this land of Ireland, that neither now, nor ever again, shall any man be prosecuted for his religion." This short period of Catholic triumph was, says the Protestant historian Mitchel, the only time in which liberty of conscience was recognised *by law* in Ireland from the days of Henry VIII. till the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829. Mitchel's *Reply to Froude*, chapter iii., p. 79. Mitchel was the son of an Ulster Protestant clergyman.

[6] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 409, 411. Compare his

Writing of the alleged organised surprise and massacre of Protestants in Ireland in 1641, the same writer says that "the charge is utterly and absolutely untrue."[7] Rev. Thomas Leland, whose extreme antipathy to his Catholic fellow-countrymen is evidenced on almost every page of his *History*, testifies "that during the Marian persecution several English families, friends to the Reformation, fled into Ireland, and there enjoyed their opinions and worship in privacy, without notice or molestation."[8] It is on record that the Catholic Corporation of Dublin housed, fed, and maintained a large number of Protestant refugees, and, after the death of Queen Mary, sent them back in safety to their homes.

Another Protestant historian, Rev. Dr. Witherow, bears willing witness to the tolerant spirit of the Catholics of the North, when "for four months, from March to August, 1689, all Ulster, except Derry and the district around Enniskillen, was completely at their mercy."[9] At the Alliance meetings of the Presbyterian Churches, held at Belfast in 1884, Rev. Dr. Killen, the historian, is reported by the *Northern Whig* of that date to have said that "there was not a single instance

---

Leaders of Public Opinion, ed. 1871, pp. 214-215. Wesley did not reciprocate the tolerant spirit he found among the Catholics of Ireland. He wrote against the removal of the Irish Penal Laws, and was replied to by Father O'Leary in what Lecky terms "a series of masterly letters." *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 132.

[7] In the first chapter, first volume, of *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Lecky deals very fully with this alleged massacre. He shows that the authorities chiefly relied on to support the story had a strong pecuniary interest in painting the deeds of the plundered Irish in the darkest colours; and (p. 72) refers to the "enormous, palpable exaggerations they display, and the absolute incredibility of their narratives." The crimes committed by the insurgents have been, says he (p. 46), "grossly, absurdly, and mendaciously exaggerated;" "hardly any page of history has been more misrepresented" (p. 46); it has been "grossly and malignantly represented" (p. 100). The story of the alleged massacre, he continues, "has been exaggerated in popular histories almost beyond any tragedy on record. It has, unfortunately, long since passed into the repertory of religious controversy, and although more than 230 years have elapsed since it occurred, this page of Irish history is still the favourite field of writers *who desire to excite sectarian or national animosity*" (p. 59). He shows (pp. 98-99) that the war of 1641 was not a religious one. The number of undoubted victims of racial and religious hate which he is prepared to admit would fall very short of those who were tortured, or slaughtered in cold blood, before and during the insurrection of 1798, mainly, as we shall see in the thirteenth chapter, by armed Orangemen. Lecky holds it as "certain that in three provinces out of the four, the actual conduct of the Irish compares in this respect [of humanity] favourably with that of their enemies" (p. 93). Cf. *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 215; Mitchel's *Reply to Froude;* O'Connell's *Memoir of Ireland;* Haverty's *History*, etc.

[8] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 259, ed. 1774.

[9] *Derry and Enniskillen*, pp. 316, 321.

on record in which any agent of the Presbyterian Church or mission in Ireland had been molested by any organised attack from Irish Catholics." Similar evidence is given by Rev. Mr. Irwin, in his *History of Presbyterianism outside Ulster* (p. 159). "Their uniform testimony," says he, "is that they, a small minority, have been treated with kindness by the great mass of the population among whom their lot is cast."

(*a*). There was, then, nothing in the past conduct of the Catholic body which would necessitate the formation of an association for the defence of the Established or any other Protestant Church in Ireland. Neither was there anything demanding such a course of action in the special circumstances of the country when Orangeism first took root, among the lower strata of society, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. (*b*). The members of the State Church enjoyed at the time a peaceful and long-established monopoly of the government of the country, together with that of its offices of honor and emolument; while (*c*) the happiest relations existed between the Catholic and the Protestant bodies throughout the nation.

A UNION OF HEARTS.

2. *Growth of Religious Toleration.*—For some thirty years before the rise of Orangeism, there had been spreading in Ireland, side by side with the growth of a patriotic and national sentiment, a steadily increasing spirit of goodwill between the Catholic and the Protestant bodies. As far back as 1770, an Irish Protestant writer could testify that "bigotry is losing its force everywhere."[10] The Volunteers of the North (where the Orange society arose) admitted Catholics to their ranks.[11] At their Convention, they turned out and presented arms to Father O'Leary.[12] In 1782, the representatives of 143 corps of this national Protestant army, with only two dissentient voices, approved of a larger mitigation of the Penal Code, and the admission of Catholics to the suffrage.[13] Lord Sheffield testified, in a work published in 1785, that the Irish Protestants, "one-fifth, or perhaps one-sixth of a nation, in possession of the power and property of the country," were "eager to communicate that power [of voting] to the remaining four-fifths, which would, in effect, entirely transfer it from themselves."[14] Irish Protestants, at that time, evidently felt that

[10] Preface to Molyneux's *Case of Ireland*, ed. 1770.
[11] Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 130.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 133.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 138; *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 428.
[14] *Observations on the Trade of Ireland*, p. 372.

they had nothing to fear from the placing of a large measure of political power in the hands of their Catholic fellow-countrymen.

Writing of a later period, Lecky says that the old Penal Code had "perished at last by its own atrocity. It became, after a time, so out of harmony with the prevailing tone of Irish opinion, that it ceased to be enforced, and *the Irish Protestants took the initiative in obtaining its mitigation.* In 1768 a Bill for this purpose passed without a division in the [exclusively Protestant] Irish Parliament, but was lost in England. In 1774, 1778, 1782, and 1792, several Relief Bills became law."[15] The great Relief Bill of 1793 became law only two years before the formation of the first Orange lodge. It gave Irish Catholics votes at Municipal and Parliamentary elections, and was "acquiesced in by the majority of the [Protestant] clergy."[16] The Commission of the Peace, the jury-box, and officerships in the army and navy, were now thrown open to Catholics. All this was done by Irish Protestants at a time "when scarcely any public opinion existed in Ireland, when the Roman Catholics were nearly quiescent, and when the leaning of the Government was generally illiberal."[17]

In 1791 (four years before the first Orange lodge was founded) the society of United Irishmen, which, says Lecky, "consisted originally chiefly of Protestants," was formed (to use their own words) "to provide a union of friendship between *Irishmen of every religious persuasion*, and to forward *a full, fair, and adequate representation of all the people* in Parliament."[18] "The Protestant gentry of Ireland had many faults," says Lecky, "but they were at this time remarkably free from religious bigotry."[19] The Orange writer Musgrave tells how they gave land and money for the erection of Catholic chapels.[20] In 1792 "a petition for [Catholic] Emancipation, signed by 600 Protestant householders of Belfast, was presented to Parliament."[21] A similar petition came from Derry in the very year in which the first Orange lodge was founded.[22] Rev. Dr. Lynch, a Derry priest, collected, in one day, close on five hundred

[15] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, pp. 129, 130.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 211. Lecky adds that this Act "produced nothing of that frantic intolerance which, both among the English and Irish clergy, was aroused by the much less important measure of 1829" (the Emancipation Act.) Dr. Killen says that the passing of this Act drove the Orangemen "almost to madness." *Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii., p. 463.

[17] Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 135.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

[19] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 286.

[20] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, 2nd ed., p. 635.

[21] Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 138.

[22] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 296.

guineas for the Long Tower church, which was begun in 1784, and completed in 1786. Of this amount, fifty guineas were contributed by the exclusively Protestant Corporation of Derry, and two hundred guineas by Harvey, Earl of Bristol, who was at the time Protestant bishop of the Maiden City.[23] Orangeism has altered all that. From its rise down almost to the present hour, the position of Catholics in Belfast and Derry is little better than it was before the Emancipation Bill became law.[24]

1795: EXTREMES MEET.

In 1795, the year in which "the illiterate mob of Peep-o'-Day Boys" assumed the title of Orangemen, the relations between the Protestant and the Catholic bodies in Ireland were happier than they had been at any time since the Reformation, or than they have ever been from the rise of the Orange society to the present day. The students of the Protestant Dublin University (Trinity College) petitioned for Catholic Emancipation in 1795, and publicly thanked Grattan for his labours in the cause.[25] As far back as 1792, the Irish Bar "was almost unanimous in favour of the Catholics."[26] Grattan could declare in Parliament in 1795, that the vast majority of the Protestant and commercial interests were in favour of Catholic Emancipation.[27] Lord Fitzwilliam, the new Viceroy, represented to the King "the universal approbation" with which Irish Protestants viewed the measure.[28] In his letter to Lord Carlisle, he states that "not one Protestant corporation, scarcely an individual, has come forward to oppose the indulgences claimed by the higher order of Catholics."[29] Lecky says that at this time (the early part of 1795) "the great majority of Protestants were unquestionably in favour of it" (Catholic Emancipation).[30] Practically the only opposition to the movement came from

---

[23] Larcom's *Ordnance Survey of Derry*, p. 109. The Long Tower church stands on the site of the old *Dubh Regles* of St. Columbcille, which dates from about A.D. 546. (*Ordnance Survey*, p. 18.) Catholic worship has been continued unbroken on that hallowed spot for over 1350 years. During the penal days the Catholics used to repair to it by stealth, and there worshipped the God of their fathers. A marble slab, with an inscription, marks the site of the tree that sheltered the hunted priest, as he ministered to his people.

[24] See Appendix A.

[25] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 343: *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 137.

[26] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 136.

[27] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 343.

[28] His letter is given in Grattan's *Life and Times*, by his son, Henry Grattan (1846).

[29] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 144.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 143; *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 285.

"an aristocratic faction," who "disliked the measure as threatening their monopoly, but it was plain that they would not resist the determination of the Government."[31] "All the leading intellects of the country," says Lecky, "almost all the Opposition, and several conspicuous members of the Government, were in favour of Emancipation. *The rancour which at present exists between the members of the two creeds appears to have been almost unknown*, and the whole obstacle to Emancipation was not the feelings of the people, but the policy of the Government."[32] "There are few facts in Irish history," says the same writer, "more certain than that the [wholly Protestant] Irish Parliament would have carried Emancipation if Lord Fitzwilliam had remained."

The reader will seek in vain, among the records of this time, for an indication of fear on the part of the Protestant body in Ireland that "the Church was in danger" in 1795, and needed a special organisation for its defence. Before the close of that fateful year, the outrages of the early Orangemen rudely broke the bond of brotherly feeling which had been long and steadily growing up between Catholic and Protestant in Ireland. The inaugural outrages of the lodges gave rise to a "fierce revival of religious animosities," which "left an enduring root of bitterness in Irish life."[33] We shall see more of this as we proceed. The altered feeling towards Catholics was strongly evidenced during the Emancipation and Disestablishment agitations, when vast numbers of petitions against these less important Relief Bills reached the British Parliament; when the Orange lodges were in a state of scarcely veiled rebellion, when the forces of the Crown were defied, the Queen threatened, and the passing of the Bills "drove the brethren almost to madness."[34] Toleration was better understood in Ireland in 1793 and 1795 (before the formation of Orange lodges), than it was in 1829 and 1869.

A CATHOLIC MINORITY.

3. In the year when the Orange society arose, Irish Protestants, even in those parts of the country where they

[31] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 285.

[32] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 136; cf. p. 215. Referring to the period of the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, in 1795, Lecky says that, at this time, "religious animosities appeared to have almost died away." *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 323.

[33] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 446.

[34] Compare Killen, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 463. Lecky says: "The concession accorded [to the Catholics] in 1793, was, in fact, *far greater and more important than that accorded* in 1829, and it placed the Roman Catholics, in a great measure, above the mercy of Protestants." *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 136.

were a small minority of the population, evidently felt that their religion had nothing to fear from their Catholic fellow-subjects. Much less had they to fear in the county of Armagh, where the first Orange lodge was founded in 1795. Lord Camden, the Viceroy, who was sent over to Ireland in that year to superintend the work of goading the people into insurrection, informed the English Government that the Protestants [Episcopalians] were "the most numerous" body in the county of Armagh.[35] Lord Gosford, a Protestant and Governor of the county in 1795, wrote to Pelham that his co-religionists were "greatly superior in strength" to the Catholics in Armagh.[36] Plowden, a contemporary historian, states that "the county of Armagh is the most Protestant [Episcopalian] county in Ireland. It is in great part a species of English colony."[37] Writing of the period when Orangeism in its present shape arose, Lecky says: "In the county of Armagh the Protestants were decidedly in the ascendent," and that they were "considerably stronger than the Catholics."[38] Again, General Craddock had proved that the forces of the Crown were quite sufficient to put down the riotous lower orders of Protestants and Catholics who filled the ranks of the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders. And the forces of the Crown were wholly in the hands of the Protestant majority. Of all parts of Ireland, the Established Church in Armagh county stood least in need of a special defensive organisation. We shall in due course see that, even if such a need had existed, the Peep-o'-Day Boys—whether known by that title, or by their later designation of Orangemen —were the last to whom the State Church would have been likely to look for aid.

LOYALTY OF IRISH CATHOLICS.

4. The Protestant historian, Lecky, says that the Irish Catholics in 1795 (the birth year of Orangeism) "could point with pride to their *perfect loyalty* for the space of a hundred years, in spite of the penal laws, of the rebellions of 1715 and

---

[35] Froude, *The English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 178, *note;* Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 434. See chap. v., *infra*, *note* 7.

[36] Quoted in Lecky's *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 431, *note*.

[37] *Hist. of Ireland from its Union with Great Britain*, vol. i., introd. p. 9. The designation "Protestant" was then appropriated exclusively by members of the Established Church. See Killen, ii., p. 363, and chapter v., *infra*, *note* 7.

[38] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 425; vol. iv., p. 47. Killen says that Armagh County was the part of Ulster, "in which the largest amount of money was expended by the state for the maintenance of [the established] religion" ii., 356.

1745, and the revolt of the colonies."[39] At the time of the Volunteer movement "they were perfectly peaceful, and, indeed, quiescent."[40] We shall see, in the course of this chapter, that the Irish Catholics as a body were quite disassociated from the feuds of the lower order of Protestants and Catholics in Armagh county, which led to the formation of the first Orange lodge. In 1793, during the debate on the Catholic Relief Bill, Lord Arthur Wellesley declared in the Irish House of Commons that the Catholic body were "as loyal and trustworthy as any other of his Majesty's subjects."[41]

"The revolutionary movement in its earlier stages existed mainly among the Protestants of the North," and principally among the Presbyterians.[42] Catholic priests looked with horror on the Revolution,[43] which had wrought such havoc upon the Church in France. Up to the withdrawal of Lord Fitzwilliam, although lawlessness existed, the Catholic masses were free from the taint of "active political disaffection."[44] The three leaders of the United Irishmen, in their *Memoir* to the Government, are quite agreed upon two points—*(a)* that their association "made but little way amongst Catholics throughout the kingdom until after the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam," and (*b*) that the Orange outrages in Ulster first drove them in considerable numbers, and for self-protection, into the ranks of the United men.[45]

In 1796—the year following the opening of the first Orange lodge—a French fleet invaded Bantry Bay. Then there was witnessed a curious contrast between the sedition of the Protestant portions of Ulster and the loyalty of the remaining three provinces of Ireland. The Viceroy, Camden, asserted that, to his personal knowledge, Ulster was at the time "ripe for revolt."[46] Belfast was the centre of the republican movement. The Sovereign of the city failed to raise even a corps

---

[39] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 149. The celebrated Father O'Leary "wrote an address to the Roman Catholics, inculcating loyalty during the Rebellion of 1745." *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

[41] Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 73.

[42] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 446; also 543, 544; v., 490, etc. *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 148.

[43] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 148. *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 511.

[44] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 446, 323; *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 148.

[45] The *Memoir* is given in full in McNevin's *Pieces of Irish History*, pp. 174-194. Cf. Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., p. 51; Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, pp. 148-149. See note 54, *infra*. Two of the authors of the *Memoir* (Emmet and O'Connor) were Protestants; the third (McNevin) a Catholic.

[46] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 544.

of yeomanry to meet the threatened invasion. "The disaffection was grave and general."[47] "Everything is quiet" [in the South and West], wrote Beresford at the time, "and loyalty apparent everywhere, *except in the North.*"[48] Even Lord Clare, in spite of his strong anti-Catholic feelings, spoke as follows in a debate in the Irish Parliament, February 19, 1798:

"During all the disturbances which prevailed in other parts of the kingdom we were in a state of profound tranquility and contentment there [in the Southern and Midland districts] . . . When the enemy appeared on the coast . . . a general sentiment of loyalty prevailed in all ranks and degrees of the people, who vied with each other in contributing to defend their country against the invaders."[49] The garrison of Dublin was reduced.[50] Catholic yeomanry corps were formed; and the Catholic population of Leinster, Connaught, and Munster turned out enthusiastically to feed the troops, repair the roads, contribute funds, and do all that lay in their power to stem the tide of French invasion.[51] Even the Ulster Catholics who had been driven out of their plundered houses "to hell or Connaught," by the Orangemen, in the depth of a bitter winter, were loyal and peaceable at the time.[52] "All the evidence we possess," says Lecky, "concurs in showing that the great body of the Catholics did not at this time show the smallest wish to throw off the English rule, and that their spontaneous and unforced sympathies were with the British flag."[53]

Whatever danger may have menaced the authority of the British Crown in Ireland in 1795—the year of the first Orange lodge—such danger did not arise from the conduct of the Catholic body, or of any considerable section of it. Again: even had such a danger existed, the last persons to whom we should have looked for a loyal defence of the Crown and Constitution would be what Protestant officials, statesmen, and historians unite in terming the "lawless banditti" of Peep-o'-Day Boys, who in 1795 took to themselves the *alias* of

---

[47] G. Brown to Pelham, Dec. 30, 1796, *Ibid.*, p. 543.

[48] *Ibid.*, cf. pp. 480, 483, 545.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 474-475.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 545; cf. p. 265.

[51] See Lecky's *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 529-548; *Dr. Lanigan, his Life and Times*, by Fitzpatrick, p. 72; *Correspondence of Edmund Burke*, iv., p. 268.

[52] Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 543.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 541; cf. pp. 443 and 540. At p. 540, he says that "although treason had of late years been zealously propagated among them, its influence was as yet very superficial."

Orangemen. There is no reason to doubt that the allegiance of the Irish Catholics would have come unscathed through the events which turned such a large proportion of Ulster Protestants into rebels, but for the inaugural outrages of the Orange lodges, and the cruel policy of Pitt in forcing the people into rebellion for the purpose of depriving Ireland of her Legislature. The Orange outrages of 1795, 1796, and 1797 produced a consternation and panic in the country such as had never been experienced since the days of Cromwell, and drove the Catholics of the North for protection into the ranks of the United Irishmen.[54] These outrages were followed fast by the Irish Reign

---

[54] "We solemnly aver," said the United leaders in what Lecky terms their "evidently truthful *Memoir*" to the Government, "that whenever the Orange system was introduced, particularly in Catholic counties, it was uniformly observed that the number of United Irishmen increased most astonishingly. *The alarm which an Orange lodge excited amongst the Catholics made them look for refuge by joining together in the United system.*" McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 178, ed. 1803. See *note* 45, *supra*.

The other leading facts connected with the society of United Irishmen may be briefly stated as follow:

(*a*) The society was founded in Belfast, in 1791, by Wolfe Tone, a Protestant barrister.

(*b*) It was at first (1791-1795) frankly loyal and constitutional; its aims being to secure, by peacable agitation, Parliamentary Reform and Catholic Emancipation. (Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 140; Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. viii., p. 411).

(*c*) When constitutional agitation utterly failed, the society adopted republican principles (1795-1798). (Lecky, *op. cit.*; Mitchel, *Hist. Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxx). They did not, however, adopt a military organisation until the end of 1796—when the Orange outrages had been in full progress for a year or more (Lecky, *Eighteenth Century* iii., 489; McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 182). Even after republicanism had become a plank of the organisation, there is evidence to show that the United leaders would have accepted Parliamentary Reform (McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 104).

(*d*) The members of the society were at first almost altogether Protestants, and mainly Presbyterians. A year or two before the insurrection, Samuel Neilson said two-thirds of them were Presbyterians and Deists, the remainder members of the Established Church and Catholics (Lecky, *op. cit.*, iii., 202, 479, 489; v., 490; *Leaders of Public Opinion*, pp. 138, 141; Dickson's *Narrative*, p. 116; Cornwallis *Correspondence*, ed. 1859, vol. ii., 338; Musgrave, *Memoirs of Different Rebellions*, ed. 1801, vol. i., p. 195). Lecky states that at least five-sixths of the United Irish leaders were Protestants. *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 242; cf. vol. iii., p. 485.

(*e*) The great centre of the United Irish society was Ulster. (Walpole, p. 464). It never secured so firm a hold on the South or West; and Wexford county, where the insurrection of 1798 broke out, was never "organised." (Walpole, ch. xx., pp. 488-489; cf. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 383).

(*f*) The society was "vehemently opposed" by the Catholic bishops and clergy (Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxviii., p. 215; ch. xxxiv., p. 283. Cf. Killen, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., p. 215; Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 512). Arthur O'Connor, one of the chief leaders, received Deacon's orders in the Established Church (Cornwallis *Corres-*

of Terror of 1797 and 1798, during the course of which the Orange yeomanry, as we shall see, took a leading part in furthering Pitt's policy, by deliberately goading and torturing the unhappy people into insurrection.

A CLOUD IN THE NORTH.

In the midst of the growing harmony and good-will between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland, there existed, among the lower orders of the population in Armagh county, elements of religious discord and turbulence which cleft the fast uniting masses of the people, and altered the whole current of the nation's subsequent history. From about 1785 to 1795 conflicts had been carried on in Armagh county between an association of the lower order of Protestants, called Peep-o'-Day Boys or Wreckers, and a combination of the same class of Catholics, who are known as Defenders. "The Peep-o'-Day Boys," says Lecky, "ultimately merged into Orangemen."[55] In the fourth chapter of this volume the reader will see that the Orange association was essentially nothing more than the Peep-o'-Day movement under an altered name, and with a more complete organisation.

In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the title of Defenderism covered a large number of distinct and unconnected movements, which were mostly agrarian, and were "to a great extent directed against the owners of property."[56] They sprung from the grinding poverty and oppression from which the Irish farming and labouring classes were suffering at the period of which I write,[57] and bore a strong resemblance in miniature to the peasant risings of the Graubund and the Bundschuh, which arose in Switzerland and the Rhine provinces, from somewhat similar causes, three centuries before. At various times and places the poverty-stricken masses banded themselves together under the title of Defenders, to agitate for fair rents,[58] for the abolition of tithes and taxes,[59] the lowering of church contributions,[60] the regulation of the price of labour, etc.[61] The Defender movement was for a long

pondence, vol. ii., p. 389, *note*). He had a cordial hatred of the Catholic Church and clergy (Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 255-256). Dr. Madden is the standard authority on the United Irish society.

[55] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. ii., p. 511.

[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 221, 223, 386, 445.

[57] A good idea of the condition of the Irish peasantry may be gained by a perusal of Arthur Young's *Tour in Ireland*, first published in 1780, and frequently reprinted since. See, for instance, Bell's edition of 1892.

[58] Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 385, 386, 387, 392.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 387-389; Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 442.

[60] Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

[61] *Ibid.*

time scarcely or not at all of a political character.[62] It was at first violently antagonistic to the United Irish society, into which it nevertheless merged in 1796,[63] in consequence of the Orange outrages in the North.

In Armagh county the Defender organisation was composed of the lower classes of the Catholic minority of that county, who were originally banded together to protect themselves against the plundering and house-wrecking carried on by the Peep-o'-Day Boys, otherwise termed the Wreckers.[64] The original quarrel between the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders began in Armagh county in 1784 or 1785. It appears to have been of the nature of a village brawl or a faction fight.[65] The distinguishing feature of the Peep-o'-Day movement, from which it took its name, and by which it is known in history, is house-wrecking, and the raiding of the homes of Catholics by night for arms. Out of this original sin—"this new form of disturbance," as Lecky terms it[66]—arose the subsequent tangle of outrage and retaliation, the results of which endure to the present day. Killen states[67] that the plundering of arms from Catholics originated with some of the lower orders of "Protestants of the Established Church." A contemporary pamphlet, which, according to Lecky, is "written with considerable knowledge," thus refers to the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders: "Here [in the county of Armagh] fanaticism reared her standard, and a number of deluded people *entered into combination for the purpose of depriving Catholics of their arms by force*. . . . For some time the Catholics remained patient and tranquil under their sufferings, although they declared that all their efforts to obtain legal redress had been unavailing, and that the necessities of the case would oblige them to enter into counter-combinations to defend their lives and properties against a banditti of plundering ruffians, who appeared to be countenanced by authority, inasmuch as they were not punished by the criminal laws of the land."[68]

---

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 266, 446.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 221, 486; McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 179.

[64] Walpole gives them both titles (xiii., 441); so do O'Connor, a non-Catholic writer *(Hist. of the Irish People*, p. 233), the author of *A History of Orangeism* (p. 18), and many others.

[65] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. x., p. 421; Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 212, 422; Musgrave's *Memoirs* vol. i., pp. 50-54.

[66] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 216.

[67] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 356.

[68] *A View of the State of Ireland, and of the Disturbances in that Country*, by "Observer," London, 1797; re-published by Dr. Madden in 1863; quoted by him in his *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., Appendix 6, p. 392. Madden says *(ibid.*, p. 328) that the pamphlet was written by an

Plowden, another contemporary historian, states that the raiding of arms was a new departure; that it originated with the Peep-o'-Day Boys; that it was carried out in such a way as to excite party feeling to the highest pitch; that it gave rise to the association known as the Defenders, who banded themselves together, as their name implies, for the defence of themselves, their homes, and their property against the depredations of the midnight marauders.[69]

A similar account of the rise of the two rival Armagh factions is given by Dr. McNevin, another writer of the period. He tells how the Peep-o'-Day Boys originated the house-plundering and raiding for weapons in Armagh county; that the Defender association, as such, "derived its name from the necessity of their situation," and that it was founded for "actual self-defence."[70] Musgrave, the Orange writer, likewise points out the new development out of which the Peep-o'-Day Boy and Defender movements, as they are known in history, arose. The Peep-o'-Day Boys, he says, assumed that name "because they visited the houses of their antagonists at a very early hour in the morning to search for arms; and it is most certain that, in doing so, they often committed the most wanton outrages, insulting their [the Catholics'] persons, and breaking their furniture."[71]

Mr. Christie, a venerable member of the Society of Friends, and eye-witness of what he relates, testified before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges, that the Defenders were originally a defensive organisation, and that the wrecking and burning of houses in Armagh and Tyrone, which he himself had witnessed, began with the Peep-o'-Day party.[72] Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, Deputy Grand Chaplain of the Orange society, was prepared to admit, before the same Committee, that the Peep-o'-Day Boys "were incited to *com-*

Ulster magistrate. The author says elsewhere that the Peep-o'-Day Boys "first set the example" of "taking arms by force" *(ibid.*, p. 329). Madden had a high opinion of "Observer's" work *(ibid.*, p. 328). Lecky's opinion, quoted above, will be found in his *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 442, *note*. See also Mitchel's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxviii., end.

[69] *Historical Review of the State of Ireland* (ed. 1803) vol. ii., pp. 201-202; cf. p. 297. Mitchel says that Plowden "is as hostile to the Defenders as any Orangeman." *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxxix., p. 223 (Cameron and Ferguson's ed).

[70] *Pieces of Irish History*, pp. 47, 113.

[71] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, vol. i , p. 54.

[72] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 5603, 5618, 5566, *sqq*. In the course of the same examination Mr. Christie said that "there were processions of that party [the Defenders] previous to the establishment of the Orangemen, *but not previous* to the establishment of the Peep-o'-Day men." Qq. 5598, *sqq*.

mence their aggressions at this early period, 1784, under the notion that they were enforcing the Popery laws," and that their "outrages" consisted in plundering Catholics of their arms early in the morning.[73] Killen, the Presbyterian historian, after having described the early faction fights between the Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders in Armagh county, says of the former: "Associated together in companies, they entered the dwellings [of the Catholics] very early in the morning [at the peep of day]; stripped them of their arms; and frequently burned their furniture. The Peep-o'-Day Boys were not long permitted to proceed without opposition. *The Roman Catholics conspired for mutual protection;* bound themselves by an oath of secrecy; and were known by the title of Defenders."[74] Thus far as regards the *origin* of the two factions. The article on "Orangemen" in *Chambers' Encyclopædia* (ed. 1865), has the following: "The members of the Protestant associations appear at first to have been known by the name of 'Peep-o'-Day Boys,' from the time at which their violences were commonly perpetrated; the Catholics who *associated together for self-defence* being called 'Defenders.'" The Protestant writer, Walpole, referring to the early encounters of the two associations, says: "The Protestants were more numerous and better armed. By law the Roman Catholics were not entitled to possess arms, and the Protestants took upon themselves to make domiciliary visits to their houses to search for arms, in the early hours of the morning, and hence obtained the name of Peep-o'-Day Boys. The Roman Catholics associated themselves for self-protection, and went by the name of Defenders."[75] In his *Past History of Ireland*, Mr. Bouverie-Pusey, who is a member of various learned societies, and describes himself (p. 6) as "a Protestant and a convinced Protestant," states (p. 102) that, after the Catholics had become possessed of arms during the Volunteer agitation, "bands of Protestants in the North combined on their own authority to disarm them. They were called 'Peep-o'-Day Boys,' because they generally carried on their operations in the early morning. A counter Catholic association was called 'Defenders.' The former constituted the germ of the association of Orangemen, which from that date till now has played such a disturbing part in the history of Ireland." On the same page he says: "We may safely conclude that the Orangemen[76] were the aggressors." A

[73] *Ibid.*, Qq. 562-563.

[74] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 356-357.

[75] *History of the Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. x., p. 421.

[76] Mr. Bouverie Pusey, like Dr. McNevin and several other writers, applies the term "Orangemen" to the Peep-o'-Day Boys, who, as we shall

similar account of the origin of the two rival factions is given by Dr. Madden,[77] Barry O'Brien,[78] and the well-known Protestant writer, Miss Harriet Martineau.[79] The noted Protestant historian, Lecky, says in his *Leaders of Public Opinion*[80]: "In 1785, however, a new type of disturbance began. Protestants in the county of Armagh, and afterwards in other districts, began to form bands under the name of Peep-o'-Day Boys, and to attack and persecute the Catholics, who then formed *societies called Defenders*, who were at first a kind of irregular police, and soon afterwards became bands of depredators." The operations of the Peep-o'-Day Boys in Armagh, says the same writer, "principally took the form of a plunder of arms, and the wreckings of Catholic chapels and houses. [Hence the name of 'Wreckers']. The name taken by the Catholics implies that the Protestants were the aggressors, and the stress of evidence favours the conclusion that in the northern counties this was the case, but many atrocious crimes were perpetrated on each side, and many lives were lost."[81]

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Three chief circumstances tended to prolong and embitter the quarrel between the Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders. These were:

1. The character of membership of the contending factions;
2. Agrarian troubles;
3. The supineness or partiality of the civil authorities.

To these may be added the apparently systematic spread of the idle tavern boasts of both factions, false rumours of intended massacre, etc., such as, at the period of the rise of

---

see in chapter iv., merely constituted the pre-lodge phase of the Orange association. Cf. chapter iii., *infra*, *note* 44.

[77] *The United Irishmen*, first series, p. 99.

[78] *Thomas Drummond*, p. 94.

[79] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 267.

[80] P. 216. A similar account of the origin of the two associations is given in the same writer's *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. ii., p. 511. "The Defenders," says he, "were professedly, as their name imports, a purely defensive body."

[81] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 212. An outrage said to have been committed by the Defenders in 1791 on a schoolmaster named Barclay was only surpassed in atrocity by the indescribable barbarities which a party of Orangemen are alleged to have inflicted on Father McMeekin, his niece, and her son, the day after the Diamond affair. These are detailed in a pamphlet published in 1802 and entitled *The Atrocities that led to the Irish Rebellion*. Cf. "M.P.", pp. 25-27. Musgrave's account of the Barclay outrage is marked by his characteristic inaccuracy, which includes an unaccountable blunder as regards dates. Musgrave is as extreme a partisan of the Peep-o'-Day Boys as he is of the Orangemen. See chapter iv., *infra*, *note* 1.

Orangeism, were, says Froude, often "invented to mislead and harass."[82]

1. Standard writers on this period of Irish history are quite agreed that the ranks of the Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders were recruited from the lowest strata of society. Feelings of religious rancour were quite foreign to the general spirit of the time, and were practically confined to "the lower orders of the two religions."[83] Musgrave, the contemporary Orange writer, describes the Protestant faction, out of which Orangeism arose, as belonging to the "lower orders."[84] Killen, the Presbyterian historian, refers to them as "crowds of miscreants," who "were as ignorant of the true spirit of the Gospel as if they had never heard the name of a Saviour."[85] The article on "Orangemen" in *Chambers' Encyclopædia* (ed. 1865) speaks of them as "the rude and illiterate mob of Peep-o'-Day Boys." The Secret Committee of the Irish House of Lords reported in 1793 that the Defenders were "poor ignorant labouring men."[86] Walpole, the Protestant historian, describes Defenderism as "a lawless outbreak of the lowest and most ignorant of the peasantry, induced by poverty and harsh treatment," and says that "both parties were composed of the lowest and most brutal of the peasantry."[87] Lecky and other writers speak in similar terms of the Defenders as well as of the members of the rival association, who, after having slaughtered large numbers of their opponents at the Diamond village in 1795, took upon themselves the new designation of Orangemen.

Both associations were secret, illegal, turbulent, in rank antagonism to the friendly spirit then prevalent between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland. Both were stained with serious crime, and were disowned by the well-disposed members of every creed. Plowden says: "The Catholics had suffered from it [Defenderism] more than their Protestant neighbours; and to its suppression they had more generally, and as largely,

---

[82] Froude, *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 190; cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 422; Musgrave, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland*, p. 54; Plowden, *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., pp. 13-14; Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxix; Madden, *United Irishmen*, first series. Mitchel, Plowden, and Madden distinctly charge the agents of the Government with exciting Catholics and Protestants to distrust, fear, and hatred of each other. See chap. xiii., *infra*.

[83] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 429.

[84] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, ed. 1801, vol. i., p. 69.

[85] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 356.

[86] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 220.

[87] *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. xiii., p. 442; ch. x., p. 421. Cf. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 94, 219, 220, 486.

subscribed."[88] In fact, Defenderism seems to have been, at least in its later developments, as hostile to the Catholic Church as the Church was to it. Archbishop Troy publicly condemned the movement; the Pope's legate excommunicated the Defenders; priests refused them the Sacraments, even at the hour of death.[89] Defenderism and Peep-o'-Day Boyism soon stank alike in the nostrils of every Irishman that loved his country or his creed. The demon of religious discord was being laid by the fast gathering spirit of friendly toleration. It was evoked by the results that followed upon the midnight raids of the rude, ragged, and illiterate Peep-o'-Day Boys. It shakes its gory locks in Ulster to this day.

LAND HUNGER.

2. *The Agrarian Trouble.*—Referring to the disturbances between the rival factions, Dr. Killen says that "jealousies in relation to the possession of land appear to have aggravated their hostility."[90] The Relief Acts passed previous to that of 1793 had placed Catholics practically on a level with Protestants as to *rights in land*. Killen continues :[91]

"Before 1793—when they [the Catholics] could not vote as freeholders—many of the Protestant aristocracy did not care for such tenants; but when they obtained the elective franchise [in 1793] this difficulty was removed, so that they became much more formidable as customers in the land market. The poorer Protestants, who lost their holdings when outbidden by these new competitors, felt deeply aggrieved; and thus personal chagrin was added to the bitterness of sectarian antipathy." Killen's statements are confirmed by Lecky.[92] The Protestant historian, Walpole, writing of the "persecutions" of 1792-1794, says that the object of the Peep-o'-Day faction "was to *expel from the country* those Roman Catholics who were scattered about amongst the Protestants of the North, and *to occupy their holdings*."[93] In the fourth chapter of this series the reader will have occasion to see how far this purpose was effected when the Peep-o'-day Boys

---

[88] *Ireland from the Union*, vol. i., introd., p. 14. Cf. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p.p. 214, 520 *(note)*; "M.P.", p. 73.

[89] Lecky, *loc. cit.*, pp. 392 *(note)*, 381, 512, 520 *(note)*, 518.

[90] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 358.

[91] *Ibid.*

[92] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 422, 424, 444, 445.

[93] *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. xiii., p. 441. Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, a Church of England clergyman, says that the object of the Peep-o'-Day Boys and of the Orangemen was "to drive the Catholics out of the northern counties of Ireland by wrecking and destroying their houses." *History of England from the Year 1830-1874*, vol. i., p. 376.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

entered upon a wider scope of outrage and proscription, under the altered title of Orangemen.

LOADING THE DICE.

3. *The Civil Authorities.*—The bitterness of the quarrel between the two rival factions was seriously aggravated by the supineness or partiality of the civil authorities. We have seen from the evidence of the well-informed contemporary pamphleteer, "Observer," that "all their [the Catholics'] attempts to obtain legal redress had been unavailing," and that practically no attempt had been made to put down the early raiding of houses by the Peep-o'-Day Boys in Armagh county, where the Protestant population were in a strong majority, and where their leaders had under their control the forces of the Crown. According to Walpole, "the authorities appeared content to permit the two fanatical parties to fight it out. *Whenever they did interfere strong partiality was shown to the Protestants.*"[94] At one time a body of Volunteers was re-organised to quell the disturbances, but, says Walpole, "this only made matters worse, as they simply took the side of the Protestants [Peep-o'-Day Boys], and occupied themselves in disarming the Defenders, while the Protestant magistracy showed a corresponding partiality."[95] Lecky tells how, at this period, large numbers of Catholic peasantry were, on mere suspicion, or from caprice, transported on board a tender by Lord Carhampton and the Ulster magistrates, "without sentence, without trial, without even a colour of legality."[96] To such men, says the same author, this fate "was more terrible than death, and if the measure produced for a time the tranquility of consternation, it left behind it the seeds of the most enduring and vindictive animosity."[97]

It is no difficult matter to foresee what would occur when two secret and rival associations, composed of the lower orders of the community, come into conflict under such added circumstances of mutual provocation as have been broadly outlined above. The Defender movement in Armagh was undoubtedly provoked by the house-wrecking and plundering which was carried out by the Peep-o'-Day Boys in a county where the Catholics were in a very decided minority. The later history of the two societies is a hopeless tangle of provocation, outrage, and retaliation, in which it is no longer possible to determine

[94] *Kingdom of Ireland.*, ch. xv., p. 456.

[95] *Ibid.*, ch. x., pp. 421-422. See also Killen, vol. ii., p. 357; Bowles Daly, *Ireland in Ninety-eight*, p. 50; Plowden, *Historical Review*, vol. ii., p. 201, ed. 1803.

[96] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 419.

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 420.

on which side lay the heavier weight of the grand total of guilt. One thing, however—which is very much to our present purpose—is placed beyond the reach of all doubt: The whole history of the Peep-o'-Day Boys utterly forbids the supposition that this early phase of Orangeism ever adopted what were in later years (and still are) alleged to be the groundwork principles of the society, namely, the defence of the Protestant religion, the maintenance of the laws, and the cultivation of virtue. The stigma of illegality, and of disregard of both human and divine law, attaches to that organisation from the day when the first oath-bound "crowd of miscreants" sallied forth under cover of darkness to do what, under the title of Orangemen, they were soon to carry out on a wider scale, and in the face of day—namely, to plunder and wreck the homes of the Catholic minority who lived amongst them. In the first of these midnight raids lies the *fons et origo* of the Orangeism of our day.

Chapter III.

THE BATTLE OF THE DIAMOND—HOW THE NEW SIGN-BOARD WAS SET UP—A QUESTION OF VERACITY: RIVAL WITNESSES AND A TANGLED TALE—"THE GREAT DAY": "IT WAS A FAMOUS VICTORY"—WHAT THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT THOUGHT OF IT—THE FIRST ORANGE LODGE.

MAHOMEDANS date their era from the Hegira, or flight, of their prophet from Mecca. This event took place in or about A.D. 622. Every historian is, however, aware that Mahometanism, as a separate religious system, had existed for many years previous to the prophet's precipitate retreat to Medina. The era of the children of Islam simply marks the period of a new departure, in which their system was consolidated and placed upon a formidable footing. Orangemen date their Hegira from the battle of the Diamond hamlet, which took place in Armagh county in 1795, between two bodies of Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders. Apart from the mere accident of name, Orangeism as a system had, however, existed for some years previous to the affray of the Diamond. The Peep-o'-Day movement was but the early or preparatory phase of the Orange association—the membership, general principles, and conduct of both being the same. This will be made abundantly evident in the course of the next chapter. After having defeated their opponents with great slaughter at Diamond Hill, the victorious Peep-o'-Day Boys took the *alias* of Orange Boys or Orange Men. The new name did not, however, bring with it any new principle of action. It simply occasioned a new departure in the old movement. It ushered in the *lodge* era of the Orange association, brought about a more complete organisation of the scattered Peep-o'-Day Boy forces, and opened out to them a wider field of activity.

The subject of the Diamond encounter calls for special notice in these pages: in the first place, because of the intrinsically important place it occupies as the Hegira of the Orange movement; in the second place, because the popular lodge narrative of it is loaded with many incidents which are legendary or unsubstantiated, but which are nevertheless advanced

with an enthusiastic positiveness of assertion by no means warranted by our present knowledge of that fateful conflict.

It is exceedingly difficult, in fact quite impossible, to arrive at a full and fair statement of the facts of the Diamond encounter. The narratives of the chief contemporary witnesses have been long out of print, are difficult of access to the general reader, contradict each other in important particulars, and are open to the suspicion of party or religious bias. The chief contemporary witnesses for the Diamond affray are four —two Catholic writers and two Orangemen. I shall give, in their chronological order, the main statements of the witnesses from each side. Out of the confused tale the reader may construct for himself, as best he can, a history of the battle of the Diamond.

RIVAL WITNESSES.

Catholic Witnesses.—The two chief Catholic writers who deal with the Diamond affair are Francis Plowden, LL.D., the historian, and Dr. McNevin, a United Irishman. Both were in the prime of life at the time of the conflict, and are acknowledged authorities on the events of the period.[1] Plowden was a "loyalist," a careful collector of documents, and, as Mitchel says, was "as hostile to the Defenders as any Orangeman."[2] His account of the Diamond affray of 1795, and of the events leading up to it, was published in 1803 and 1811.[3] Dr. McNevin's narrative saw the light in 1807.[4]

Orange Witnesses.—The two chief Orange witnesses as to the affray of the Diamond Hill are two officers of militia—

---

[1]They are both extensively quoted by Lecky, Killen, and generally by historians who deal with the latter years of the eighteenth century.

[2]*Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxix., p. 223, *note*. See, for instance, Plowden's *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol, ii., part i., p. 386.

[3]In his *Historical Review*, London, 1803 (vol. ii., p. 539); *History of Ireland from its Union with Great Britain*, Dublin, 1811 (vol. i., introd., pp. 16 *sqq.*) The dedication of both these works was accepted by the then Prince of Wales.

[4]In his *Pieces of Irish History*, New York, 1807. Doctor McNevin was born in 1763. The United Irish society and their "French principles" were, as has been seen, violently opposed by the Irish Catholic episcopate and priesthood. This opposition was to some extent repaid in kind. In his examination before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, August 7th and 8th, 1798, McNevin was asked by Lord Kilwarden, if, in the event of a successful rebellion, he would have favoured the setting up of the Catholic Church as the established religion in Ireland. He replied: "I would no more consent to that than I would to the establishment of *Mahometanism*" (Madden's *United Irishmen*, 2nd Series, Vol. ii., p. 244). His character is thus detailed by a Protestant writer, Webb, in his *Compendium of Irish Biography* (p. 321): "The most striking features of his character were imperturbable coolness and self-possession, combined with remarkable simplicity of mind and singleness of purpose."

Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker and Lieutenant-Colonel Verner.[5] They were—by a singular coincidence—the only witnesses examined on the events of that day by the Select Parliamentary Committee appointed in 1835 to inquire into the Orange society. Their statements are contained in the *Minutes of Evidence* submitted by the Committee to the House of Commons. Both were boys (Verner was 13 years old) at the time of the Diamond Hill encounter.[6] Both were Orangemen from the first; they were personal friends; belonged to wholly Orange families; held high office in the association; and were notorious throughout their lives for the depth and activity of their acrimony against their Catholic fellow-countrymen. Their story of the fight was told in 1835, forty years after the event, at a time when Orangeism was on its trial before the British Parliament, and when the leaders of the society were straining every nerve to conceal the damaging evidence which eventually led to the suppression of the organisation. Colonel Blacker's account is the fuller, and—if he had been an unprejudiced witness—the more authoritative. A few facts as to these witnesses, their sources of information, etc., will the better enable the reader to gauge the value of their testimony.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL BLACKER.

The personal bias of Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker may be inferred from the following facts:

1. He resided, according to his evidence, "in the neighbourhood of Portadown," the district which had been thrown into a fresh ferment of religious fanaticism by the intemperate discourse of Rev. Mr. Mansell, and which (according to Mr. Blacker) had furnished the principal contingent of outside Peep-o'-Day Boys who fought at the Diamond.

2. In the course of his examination before the Select Parliamentary Committee, he deposed that he was then (in 1835) within "about six weeks" of being forty years an Orangeman. This would give us "about" September 12th, 1795, as the date of his initiation. If this is correct, our witness must have been sworn in a Peep-o'-Day Boy, the battle of the Diamond and the formation of the first Orange lodge not having taken place till September 21st of that year. Allowing, however, a sufficiently wide margin of time for the word "about," he would still have been among the very first to join the Orange associa-

[5] Lieutenant-Colonel Verner was M.P. for Armagh county. He is, I think, the writer of *A Short History of the Battle of the Diamond*, which appeared in 1863, when he would be 81 years old.

[6] *Minutes of Evidence*, Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835, Q. 135.

tion. In his examination by the Select Committee he stated that he was Grand Master of the county of Armagh; he was also Deputy Grand Master for Ireland.[7]

3. He admitted before the Select Committee that he was "mixed up with the transactions of the Diamond" to the extent of running into bullets "a considerable quantity of lead," and of having it "conveyed to the persons of my neighbourhood who were going to fight the battle of the Diamond."

4. In the course of his evidence, he states that his "principal information" was derived from Captain Atkinson, "*who took a principal part in the transaction* [the Diamond affray] that led to the origin of the Orangemen; and also several others of *a lower rank in society, who were mixed up with these transactions.*" The Captain Atkinson referred to was one of the first Orangemen.[8] In conjunction with his two friends, Verner and Blacker, he took a leading part in the discreditable police-court proceedings which followed the destruction of the Catholic village of Maghery, in 1830, by the notorious band of Orangemen known as the "Killyman Wreckers."[9] It will thus be seen that both our witness and his informants are wholly Peep-o'-Day or Orange. Nay more; one and all of them had, quite apart from political or sectarian feeling, the strongest personal interest in putting the most favourable construction upon the sanguinary and peculiarly suspicious-looking affair in which, apparently without the loss of a single drop of blood, they contrived to take the lives of some forty-eight Defenders.

5. Readers of Colonel Blacker's evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835,[10] will be forcibly struck with his unwillingness to state, even on oath, facts which, though sufficiently notorious, might be deemed damaging to the Orange institution. When examined as to the early forms and subsequent alterations of the society's oaths, he was seized with that sudden paralysis of memory, and that mysterious hesitancy of speech, which have afflicted Orange witnesses, when questioned on lodge secrets, from the days of the Diamond down to the

---

[7] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 9282. See also list of Irish Grand Lodge officers at beginning of Appendix to Third Parl. *Report*. Another member of the same family—Stewart Blacker—was also Deputy Grand Master, and Rev. J. S. Blacker, Grand Chaplain. Yet another, Captain William Blacker, was a Grand Officer of the first Grand Lodge ever formed, in 1797. The *Dublin University Magazine* for April, 1835, says that all Dean Blacker's sons were among the first members of the Orange society. Quoted by "M.P.," p. 82.

[8] *Hist. of Orangeism*, by "M.P.," p. 19 *note*; cf. pp. 175, *sqq*; cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 55.

[9] See this chapter, *infra*.

[10] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq, 8930-8955, 9280 *sqq*., 9387-9394,

Melbourne Post Office Inquiry of 1896.[11] He "could not recollect" the alteration made in the Orange oath about 1821.[12] He garbled one oath about which he was questioned, by suppressing its most notorious feature—that of conditional loyalty. And yet he had been an Orangeman from the very foundation of the society. The oath referred to, as well as its subsequent alterations, were in the printed books of rules, and are published in an Appendix to the Parliamentary *Reports* of 1835. During his forty years of membership he must have administered it, or seen it administered, to considerable numbers of persons in the great Orange county of which he had been so long Grand Master. We have no reason to believe that Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker's memory was clearer, or his candour greater, with regard to events which took place at the Diamond hamlet in 1795, and which he had learned almost altogether on hearsay from interested parties.

6. Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker's partiality as a magistrate, in cases in which Catholics and Protestants were concerned, had long been a subject of bitter complaint. He warned the Government in 1832 that Stanley's Party Processions Act of that year would only have the effect of producing three Orange processions where there had been only one before.[13] He did what lay in his power to bring about the fulfilment of his prophecy. According to the evidence of a Protestant magistrate, Colonel Blacker "gave three cheers" to a number of Lurgan Orangemen who were being prosecuted for having taken part in an illegal procession.[14] In his evidence before the Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835 he unhesitatingly swore that the Orangemen of Ulster are more peaceable in their demeanour on each succeeding twelfth of July than they are on the other 364 days of the year![15] In 1833 he was called upon by the Government for an explanation of his conduct as a magistrate at Portadown. In reply, he wrote a letter practically threatening armed resistance if Orange processions were to be interfered with.[16] The very next year (1834) Government found it necessary to dismiss him from the Commission of the Peace. On the 12th of July of that year he had

[11] See Preface.

[12] *Report* of English Select Committee. Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 426, *note*. Deputy Grand Chaplain Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, who had been an Orangeman only a few years, could, under examination, easily remember both the oath of conditional loyalty and the subsequent alterations in it (Qq. 588, *sqq.*).

[13] *Minutes of Evidence*, Select Parl. Committee, and Appendix D2, p. 179.

[14] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 8827.

[15] *Ibid.*, Q. 8975-8976.

[16] The letter is quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 186.

openly countenanced and addressed an illegal procession of some 2,000 Orangemen at Portadown. In the words of Captain Patten (a Protestant Police Inspector), "he and his brother magistrates [including Colonel Verner] acted as if no such law as the Anti-Processions Act were in force." Riots ensued. The names of the offenders—who were Orangemen—were taken down and sent to Dublin Castle. The Attorney-General ordered that informations should be taken, and the incriminated brethren returned for trial. Mr. Blacker positively refused to take the informations. Nay more: he prevailed upon the other magistrates to do the same, and thus for a time succeeded in frustrating the law, and screening his fellow-Orangemen from justice. An inquiry was instituted by the Government into Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker's conduct, and he was dismissed from the bench.[17] This was in 1834, less than a year before he told his tale of the Diamond encounter to the Select Committee of the House of Commons. Lieutenant-Colonel Verner "resigned the magistracy in disgust at Colonel Blacker's dismissal." So runs the *Report* of the English Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835.

Like Colonel Blacker, Colonel Verner belonged to an Armagh family who were intimately bound up with the leadership of the Orange society from its very foundation, and who were moreover notorious for their active persecution of the Catholic minority who lived about them. In his evidence before the Select Committee (of which he and two other Orangemen were members) Colonel Verner described himself as a "Deputy Grand Master of the Institution, and Deputy Grand Master of the county of Armagh."[18] Those who

---

[17] *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report*.

[18] According to the *Dublin University Magazine* for April, 1835, the five Verner brothers were among the first initiated into the Orange society (quoted by "M.P.," p. 82.) Col. Verner was one of these. In his evidence before the Select Committee, he said that his eldest brother was "the first Grand Master" of the Orange society. Thomas Verner was Grand Master in 1800. James Verner, the Colonel's father, was an attorney. The contemporary writer, Plowden, says of him: "He was then [in 1795], as he still [1811] continues to be, prominently conspicuous for depressing and persecuting the Catholics." He banished 96 Catholic families from an estate left to his younger son (a minor.) His corps of yeomanry, says Plowden, on their way to church, fired into a congregation of Catholics at Tartarahan, killing and wounding several persons. On their return they demolished the chapel (*Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., pp. 47-48, *note;* also pp. 25, and 124, *note.)* Mr. Wilson, an English Protestant, who was a magistrate in Ulster, accused James Verner's sons (of whom the Colonel was one) of having headed the party of Orangemen who, without provocation, shot at Constantine O'Neil, a Catholic hatter, and burned his house, in 1806. Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., ch. xii; Plowden, *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., p. 48, *note.*

have toiled through the voluminous *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Parliamentary Committee (Irish) of 1835 will recall his connection with illegal Orange processions: his highly reprehensible conduct as a magistrate and yeomanry officer, in permitting a body of armed Orangemen (the "Killyman Wreckers"), without the slightest interference, to deliberately invade and wreck, before his very eyes, and almost at his own door, twenty-eight houses in the Catholic village of Maghery.[19] This was in November, 1830, less than five years before he gave his version of the battle of the Diamond to his brother members of the Select Parliamentary Committee. He had received due notice of the intended outrage. In his corps of armed yeomanry he had at hand the means of preventing it. He preferred to remain an interested spectator, while his brother Orangemen destroyed the homes of twenty-eight of his Catholic neighbours. He subsequently refused to identify a single one of the Orange rioters, although they belonged to his own neighbourhood, and had carried on their work of destruction from start to finish in his presence and in the open noon-day.

A more glaring instance of his partiality to Orangemen and of his animosity towards Catholics, was soon given by the gallant colonel. The gang of Orange "Wreckers" were acquitted in the face of the clearest evidence of their guilt, largely through his instrumentality. The bench was carefully packed by Orange magistrates. Among them sat our other witness for the Diamond affray, Lieutenant-Colonel

[19] Two official reports of this bad business were sent to the Government, one by Mr. Sergeant Perrin, the other by Mr. J. W. Handcock, J.P., both Protestants. Both reports strongly inculpate Col. Verner. In his own depositions (given in Appendix to *Report* of Select Committee, 154), he says that he never "called upon any of the persons mentioned by him to arrest or stop any of the party, nor did he on his return desire them to do so." Mr. Perrin condemns the refusal of the Colonel and others to identify the Orange wreckers, who, he said, were "guilty of felony." He concludes: "I am further of opinion that Colonel Verner appears not to have performed his duty as a magistrate at Verner's Bridge, in order to disperse (as he was bound and required by law) the persons there tumultuously and unlawfully assembled, and compel them to depart to their habitations; that he did not take the measures and precautions proper for that purpose, which he was empowered and required by law to take, and which the result evinces to have been necessary for the preservation of the peace and the threatened breach thereof; and that he is liable to be prosecuted at the suit of the Crown, by information, for such (as it seems to me) *criminal neglect of his duty*." The Colonel was not prosecuted. An instructive account of Mr. Verner's share in this transaction is given in the *Minutes of Evidence* of the Select Parliamentary Committee, Qq. 8678 and following. The matter was ventilated in Parliament. See Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. xxxix., p. 662. Cf. *note* 20, p. 43.

Blacker. The court was presided over by none other than Mr. Atkinson (Q. 9397), the leader of the Peep-o'-Day Boys who fought at the Diamond, and Mr. Blacker's principal informant for the events of the "great day." *The same bench of magistrates, on the same day, sentenced to three months' imprisonment several of the homeless Catholics of Maghery for having damaged the drums of the Killyman Orange Wreckers to the estimated value of ten shillings.* The loss inflicted on the unresisting Catholic villagers amounted to about £600.[20] Three members of this bench of magistrates—Blacker, Verner, and Atkinson—are our chief Orange informants as to the facts of the battle of the Diamond, which took place in 1795 between a body of Catholics and the very men who, on the evening of the conflict, originated the first Orange lodge.

Stronger evidence could scarcely be needed of the marked partiality of those who told the story of the Diamond encounter in 1835. But there are certain further facts in connection with Colonel Verner which quite discredit him as a witness, apart altogether from the strong sectarian warp of his feelings. The facts are recorded in the *Minutes of Evidence*, and the Appendix thereto, which were laid upon the table of the House of Commons by the Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835, of which he was himself a member.

According to the official report of Captain Duff, a Protestant Inspector of Police, and the sworn evidence of this same Captain Duff, a sergeant of police and two privates, Colonel Verner, "wearing orange and purple," headed (with others) a procession of 4,000 to 5,000 Orangemen at Dungannon on the 27th of April, 1832.[21]

---

[20] On November 19, 1830, the Killyman Orangemen marched with band and banners through the Catholic village of Maghery. According to the Protestant magistrate, Mr. Handcock, the villagers were "in high good humour," and asked the Orangemen to play some tunes. The request was complied with, and the processionists went on their way unmolested. On the following day (Saturday, the 20th), the Killyman "Boys" again reached the village, on their return march. Some villager asked them to play "St. Patrick's Day," which is not a party tune, but is recognised, even in the army, as the national air of Ireland. The Orange bandsmen replied by striking up one of their party tunes, "The Protestant Boys." A scuffle ensued, the brethren were routed, and their drums, etc., damaged to the estimated value of ten shillings. On the following Monday they returned to Maghery, heavily armed. Rev. Mr. Donaldson, a Protestant clergyman, swore that he counted 49 muskets, bayonets, etc. In revenge for the defeat of Saturday, the Orangemen wrecked 28 houses in Maghery. There was no resistance. See Perrin's official *Report*, in Irish *Report*, pp. 174-178; Mr. Handcock's evidence, Qq. 8014 *sqq.*; also Qq. 7840 *sqq.* The Maghery prisoners were released at the instance of Lord Charlemont. *Minutes of Evidence*, Select Parl. Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges, Qq. 8732, 8733.

[21] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Report of 1835, Qq. 7864, *sqq.*, 8046-8056.

A scuffle ensued in consequence. Pistol-shots were fired by the processionists, one of the bullets breaking the arm of a Catholic named Peter Tully. According to the official report and the sworn depositions of the witnesses just referred to, a great meeting of the Orange processionists was next held, of all places, in the *court-house* of Dungannon. Colonel Verner entered and took part in the proceedings. He was called upon by Lord Caledon[22] (a Protestant, and Governor of the county), and by the Lord Chancellor, for an explanation of his conduct. The gallant colonel's defence was—*an alibi*. He denied that he had been in the procession, that he had been decorated, that he had been at the Orange meeting in the court-house at Dungannon! In the face of this denial, we have, not merely the sworn depositions of eye-witnesses mentioned above, but the resolutions of the court-house meeting referred to, which were subsequently published, and which are to be found at Q. 8056 of the Parliamentary Committee's *Report*. One of the resolutions runs as follows: "That the thanks of this Grand Lodge are eminently due, and are hereby given, to Brother *William* Verner [the Colonel], Brother James Verner, and Brother John Ellis, *for their attendance here this day.*"[23]

In plain terms, Colonel Verner was convicted of rank prevarication. This was in 1832. We have no evidence to show that in the interval between that date and 1835 (when he told his hearsay tale of the Diamond) he had outgrown the use of that ready resort which makes the character of Tartuffe even more contemptible than it is amusing.[24] This leaves his friend and co-Deputy Grand Master, Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker, as practically our only Orange witness for the incidents of the Diamond Hill affray. I shall, nevertheless, include Colonel Verner's scanty statements in my narrative. The reader can take them for what they are worth.

A DAY OF DIRE NEED.

In dealing with the question of the reliability of Colonels

[22] *Ibid.*, Qq. 8052, 8055.

[23] In his examination before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, Colonel Verner admits that he was at the procession, wore an Orange handkerchief, attended the court-house meeting, and received a vote of thanks. (Qq. 9665-9671).

[24] At a later date, in 1837, when taken to task by Under-Secretary Drummond for having, at an election dinner, proposed the toast of "The Battle of the Diamond" (he being a J.P.), he professed not to know *what* battle was referred to. The Under-Secretary referred him to his (the Colonel's) evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835. The Colonel was struck off the roll of magistrates and off the list of Deputy-Lieutenants of Tyrone county. The matter was ventilated in Parliament, when not one member ventured to defend Colonel Verner's action. See Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. xxxix., pp. 634, 687.

Blacker and Verner as witnesses for the events of the battle of the Diamond, we must not lose sight of the special and peculiar circumstances in which their account of the rise of Orangeism was given to the world. Their story of the Diamond affray was given at the most critical and disastrous period in the history of Orangeism, when it was on its trial, so to speak, for life or death, and when, of all times, its leaders felt the most urgent need of having its origin justified, its existence vindicated, its virtues—if it possessed any—brought into strong relief, and its failings covered over with a friendly cloak of silence.

The defeat and disaster of the Orange society came in 1835, when it was nearing the summit of its highest triumph. It had invaded the highest offices of the State. In spite of stringent military regulations, it had corrupted the fidelity and interfered with the discipline of a great part of the army. It had in its ranks, according to its secretary, Swan, some 220,000 men in Ireland, and (by the *Report* of the English Parliamentary Committee), 120,000 to 140,000 in England. This great body of men were "mostly armed," and ready to shoulder their muskets and march at the command of the Imperial Grand Master, H.R.H. Ernest, Duke of Cumberland. This autocrat of the society used the Royal arms, presided in regal state at the Grand Lodge meetings in London, and was styled by the English Grand Lodge "the nearest to the throne."[25] William IV. was visibly nearing the close of his days. Both in and out of Parliament the Orange association was stated to be engaged in a vast conspiracy to alter the succession to the throne—to set aside the just claims of the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, and to place the crown of England on the head of the Imperial Grand Master, Cumberland, "the hoary tyrant of Hanover," as O'Connell designated him. The whole conduct of the Orange leaders, and the correspondence of their Deputy Grand Secretary, Fairman, lent a strong support to the charge of conspiracy, while the subsequent revelations showed that the organisation, by reason of its aims, methods, secrecy, and vast resources of armed physical force, was a standing menace to the peace of the Empire. Parliament took alarm. A Select Parliamentary Committee[26] was appointed to inquire into and

[25] Draft address of the English Grand Lodge to Carlton Club, given in English Select Committee's *Report*, p. 17.

[26] The Irish Select Committee (appointed by the House of Commons), consisted originally of twenty-seven members. Thirteen of these were Conservatives (belonging to the same political party as the Orangemen), some twelve were Liberals, and one or two were neutral. Among the Conservative members of the Committee were Colonel Verner (our witness), Sir Edmund Hayes, and Mr. Maxwell. These were all officers of

report upon the origin, working, and tendency of the Orange society in Ireland. The disquieting revelations made before the Irish Committee soon led to the appointment of another Select Committee, to inquire into Orangeism in Great Britain and the colonies. Orangemen in Parliament opposed the motion tooth and nail—they had already had more than enough of inquiry. The motion was, nevertheless, carried by a large majority.[27] The Select Committees were composed almost altogether of Protestants of every shade of political opinion, and included several leaders of the incriminated association. The alarm of the Grand Lodges knew no bounds, and efforts were put forth to suppress information that might be damaging to the institution.

(*a*) The Duke of Cumberland, the Imperial Grand Master, refused point blank to give evidence.

(*b*) At least one of the books of the Grand Lodge was mutilated before being handed over to the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry.[28]

(*c*) Others were withheld altogether. Our witness, Colonel Vérner, was seized at a critical moment with the typical Orange loss of memory, and twice "forgot" to bring before the Committee the early rules and regulations of the society, which he admitted were in his possession. Fairman, the Deputy Grand Secretary, defied the House of Commons,

---

the Dublin Grand Lodge, and prominent leaders of the Orange society. (See list of officers given in Appendix to the *Minutes of Evidence* of the Irish Select Committee.) Twenty-two witnesses were examined by this Committee. Of these, *eight* were officers of the Dublin Grand Lodge, or leading members of the Irish Orange association; four were officers of police (Protestants); two were Lords Lieutenant of counties (Protestants); three were magistrates (Protestants); two lawyers (one a Catholic); two farmers (Protestants); and one a doctor. They all resided in the districts where the Orange society was most active. The witnesses were mostly adherents of the Church of England, which furnished by far the greater bulk of the membership of the lodges. All, with the exception of the Orange leaders, expressed opinions strongly condemnatory of the institution. The number of Grand Officers on the Irish Select Committee (which was almost exclusively Protestant) may possibly account for the fact that *only Orange witnesses*—one of them a member of the Committee—were asked to give an account of the Diamond affray. The same circumstance may also have some connection with the fact that, as the Right Hon. R. L. Shiel said in the House of Commons, the order of the proceedings were inverted: the Orange party were allowed to open the case themselves; for a number of days none but Orange witnesses were examined; many of them were recalled, Rev. M. O'Sullivan, Deputy Grand Chaplain, appearing before the Committee *five times*. Shiel's speech in the House, August 11, 1835, in his *Speeches*, ed. 1868, p. 120; see also *Minutes of Evidence*, first, second, and third Irish *Reports*.

[27] Hansard, third series, vol. xxx., pp. 58, 239.

[28] See chap. vi., *infra*.

which had peremptorily ordered him to produce a certain letter-book of the institution. He was committed to Newgate, and absconded. Other Grand Lodge records also mysteriously disappeared.[29]

(*d*) All the Orange leaders, with but one exception (according to the English Committee's *Report*) positively declined to give any information as to the oaths, secret signs and passwords, etc., in use in the society.[30]

(*e*) The Duke of Cumberland, Lord Kenyon, and other members of the inner circle of the association, were (as may be seen by the *Minutes of Evidence* and the English Committee's *Report*) convicted out of their own mouths of palpable prevarication in connection with the illegal spread of Orangeism in the army.[31]

In the sixth and fifteenth chapters I shall have occasion to enter more fully into the desperate and unscrupulous efforts which were put forth by the Orange leaders in 1835, to justify the existence of their association, to minimise, destroy, or remove from the official eye the evidence of its misdeeds, and to break the force of the blow which temporarily blotted the society out of existence in England, and which destroyed for ever the vast political power it had previously enjoyed.

Such were the circumstances under which the story of the battle of the Diamond and of the rise of Orangeism was told by two such violent partisans as Messrs. Blacker and Verner—forty years after the event, upon hearsay, without cross-examination, and without even an attempt to elicit a scrap of evidence on the subject from witnesses from the other side, many of whom must have been at the time still living. In the circumstances, it would be folly to expect that the account given by the two friends, Messrs. Blacker and Verner, is a fair and full narrative of the incidents that took place on that autumn day, September 21st, 1795, in the hamlet of the Diamond in far-off Armagh. We shall, however, give their version of the affray, checking it here and there, as occasion may arise, with the earlier narratives furnished, under decidedly less suspicious circumstances, by the certainly not more prejudiced witnesses, Plowden and Dr. McNevin.

BEFORE THE BATTLE.

State of Parties in the Diamond district.—Reference has already been made to the numerical superiority and complete

---

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] See chap. xv., *infra*. The Duke's false statement was made in letter addressed by him to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee.

political ascendency of the Protestant population in the county of Armagh at the period of which I write. The district in which the Diamond hamlet was situated, seems to have been, at least for some time, free from the more serious forms of outrage and retaliation which marked the "ancient village feud" of the Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders in other parts of the county. Blacker, in his evidence[32] on the subject says that he "was at school till just before this period," but that he understood *from others* that the Protestants of the district [who were well armed and in a stronger numerical majority] "were in the most persecuted state, that they were *worried and beaten* coming from fair and market *upon various occasions.*" No more serious form of disturbance is laid by this witness to the charge of the Defender party in his neighbourhood.

McNevin says: "An affray near Lough Brickland, on the borders of the counties of Down and Armagh, and another at the fair of Loughgall [in the very heart of the Diamond district] preceded and led to" the engagement of the Diamond.[33]

According to the contemporary writer, Plowden, there had been a lull in the disturbances between the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders in Armagh, when the feud was "rekindled by secret agents, and converted into a ferocious warfare of religious contention."[34] In his evidence before the Select Committee of 1835, Mr. Christie, a Quaker eye-witness, who lived near the spot, deposed that this fresh outbreak took place in 1794 and continued up to and after the battle of the Diamond in 1795; that it originated in the Churchill district (the seat of the Verners) and the Portadown district (in which the Diamond is situated); that it took the shape of attacks by night on Catholic houses, "a considerable number" of which were wrecked, burned, etc.; and that he knew of no Protestant homes having been wrecked at this period.[35] Lecky grants that "in the latter part" of 1795, the Defender disturbances, though far from ended, "appear to have perceptibly diminished."[36] Plowden relates how the newly aroused sectarian animosity was fanned into brighter flame by what we may term by anticipation an Orange sermon, delivered at Portadown by Rev. Mr. Mansell, on the first of July, 1795. Accord-

[32] Blacker's evidence will be found in the Irish Committee's *Minutes*, Qq. 8930-8955; Verner's in Qq. 80 to 83, 92, 106-108.

[33] *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 114, New York, 1807.

[34] *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol i., Introd., p. 17. McNevin, in his *Pieces of Irish History*, says that the Defenders were quiet from 1789, onwards, until roused by "fresh aggressions" (p. 48; cf. p. 112).

[35] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5589. See also Qq. 5566 *sqq.*, 5573-5574, 5585, 5587.

[36] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol., iii. p. 388.

ing to this author, the Portadown clergyman so wrought upon the feelings of his hearers, that some of them forthwith proceeded to assault the Catholics of the district, and wreck their houses, concluding the day's work with the murder of two unoffending peasants who were cutting turf in a bog. We shall in due course have occasion to see that some of the most sanguinary riots in Orange history—as the great Belfast civil war of 1857—were in some measure due to the intemperate utterances of clergymen of the type of the Rev. Mr. Mansell.

According to Plowden, the re-awakened fury extended to Lurgan, where some Catholics were assaulted, "but no lives were lost in the affray."[37] The local Catholic body thereupon met, and were admonished by their leading co-religionists not to take "retaliation or revenge into their own hands." "Pacific and loyal resolutions," Plowden continues, "were entered into by the Catholics, and liberal Protestants were invited to do the like. A thousand copies of these resolutions were circulated through the district with the happiest effect. Tranquility and order were preserved for a considerable time on one side of the Bann."[38] In a footnote (p. 19) he adds: "So powerful were the effects of these resolutions, that not one individual Catholic or Protestant from Lurgan was engaged in the battle of the Diamond.

THE FIRST SKIRMISH.

The parties engaged.—It seems clear that the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders who took part in what Verner and Blacker term the first skirmish of the Diamond, were gathered altogether, or almost altogether, from the surrounding districts. (*a*) In describing (on hearsay) the Defenders who had come into Loughgall, Blacker implicitly associates them with the fair-day and market-day brawls which (he had heard) had "upon various occasions" taken place in the surrounding districts while he was away at school. (*b*) He distinguishes those who took part in the preliminary skirmish from another body of Defenders, "not belonging [as he understood] to the county of Armagh," who *subsequently* came upon the scene, and fought what is termed *the* battle of the Diamond, on the 21st of September.

Referring to the local Defenders, Blacker said: "I *believe* their *principal intention* was to disarm the district." He does not accuse them thus far of any outrage, nor does he hint that they even *attempted* to carry their supposed intention into effect. Had such a large body of men as he describes seriously

[37] Plowden, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

attempted to "disarm the district," they would undoubtedly have got possession of many of "the great number of old volunteer firelocks" which (he said) "were in that quarter of the country," which, he believed, "were almost exclusively Protestants'," and which created such havoc among the ill-armed Defenders at the encounter of the Diamond. Mr. Christie, the Quaker eye-witness referred to above, describes the Catholics of these districts as being armed at this time with nothing better than "pitchforks and swords, and things of that sort," and as having no leaders.[39] Mr. Blacker adds that the Protestants [Peep-o'-Day Boys] of the district assembled to oppose the Defenders, and there came in to their assistance Protestants from the other districts of the county, particularly from the neighbourhood in which I reside" [Portadown, the residence also of Rev. Mr. Mansell].

In reply to a question put by the Select Committee as to the date of the Diamond encounter, Col. Blacker said: "Monday was the 21st—*the great day*—and I think it began about Wednesday before, in September, 1795. The parties skirmished, if I may use the expression, for a day or two, without much harm being done." His friend, Lieutenant-Colonel Verner, also said "there had been a previous skirmish."[40]

Plowden, writing in 1811, after referring to the friendly spirit evoked by the action of the Catholic body at Lurgan, thus describes the preliminary encounter of the Diamond: "But in the neighbourhood of Portadown [he is recounting the effects of Rev. Mr. Mansell's sermon] the animosity of the opposite parties [the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders] had taken so decided a turn that the Defenders remained under arms for three days successively, challenging their opponents *to fight it out fairly in the field rather than harass them with murderous nocturnal visits*."[41]

McNevin, in the work previously quoted (p. 114) says: "For some days previous to this [the Diamond affray] both parties had been preparing and collecting their forces; they seized the different passes and roads; had their advanced

---

[39] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Qq. 5623-5625.

[40] *Ibid.*, Q. 82.

[41] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 18, 19; cf. *Historical Review*, vol. ii., p. 202. The Diamond is situated "in the neighbourhood of Portadown." Deputy Grand Chaplain Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges, testifies to the challenge which preceded the first engagement, but declines to say from which side it came (Qq. 577). He also states that the parties to this conflict were, as far as he could learn, the Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders (Qq. 579, 581). Col. Blacker states that the same "Protestant" body fought in both of the Diamond encounters.

posts, and were in some measure encamped and hutted. No steps were, however, taken by the magistrates of the county, nor, as far as can be inferred from any visible circumstances, even by the Government itself, to prevent this religious war, publicly levied and carried on in one of the most populous, cultivated, and highly improved parts of the kingdom.[42] Nay more: the party *which provoked the hostilities*, and which the event proved to have been the stronger [the Peep-o'-Day Boys] boasted of being connived at, for its well-known loyalty and attachment to the Constitution.[43] Whatever may have been the motives for this inaction, certain it is that both parties assembled at the Diamond, to the amount of several thousands. The Defenders were the most numerous, but the Orangemen[44] had an immense advantage in point of preparation and skill, many of them having been members of the old Volunteer corps, whose arms and discipline they still retained, and perverted to very different purposes from those that have immortalised that body. The contest [the first skirmish] was not long or doubtful; the Defenders were speedily defeated, with the loss of some few killed and left on the field of battle, besides the wounded, whom they carried away." He then goes on to describe the truce and the subsequent battle of September 21st.[45]

"THE GREAT DAY."

After describing the preliminary encounters between the

[42]This statement as to official supineness is fully borne out by Walpole, whose words have been quoted above.

[43]This was their *boast*, as the author points out. In this respect there was a strong resemblance between them and the Orangemen, who, as we shall see in subsequent chapters, were loudest in their protestations of loyalty at the periods when their actions were most disloyal and seditious. We have seen above how some of the magistrates connived at the turbulence of the Peep-o'-Day Boys, for party purposes, just as the early Orangemen were encouraged for political reasons.

[44]See chapter ii., *supra*, *note* 76.

[45]Colonel Blacker corroborates in 1835 many of the statements published by McNevin in 1807: *(a)* as to the general fact of the massing of the rival forces; *(b)* as to their relative numbers (both here agreeing with Plowden), *(c)* as to their armament. Blacker was asked by the Committee: "Which [party] appeared to be best armed? I should say the Protestants were the best armed, and I will state the reason: there were a great number of old volunteer firelocks in that quarter of the country, and I believe they were almost exclusively Protestants'" *(d)* "A day or two" of "skirmishing" with such weapons, and by such large bodies of men, would naturally result in the few deaths and wounds which were inflicted, according to McNevin, on the badly armed Defenders, "without much harm being done" to the Peep-o'-Day Boys. This was precisely what happened at *the* battle of the 21st. *(e)* Blacker refers to the Peep-o'-Day Boys as "marching," "counter-marching," etc., as if they still retained some idea, at least, of military form.

Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders, Blacker continues (his evidence here being altogether hearsay or conjecture):

"Mr. Atkinson on one side, and the priest of the parish on the other, did their best to reconcile matters, and thought they had succeeded, as the Defenders on their part had agreed to go away, and the Protestants to return to their houses. I believe both parties were sincere at that time in their wish to separate, and that they were going to their respective homes. [A few questions further on, he says: "I have already stated that *the parties* (plural) who were *first* at variance *had separated*"]. At that time, *as I understand*, a large body of Defenders, not belonging to the county of Armagh, but assembled from South Monaghan, and, *I believe*, Cavan and Tyrone, came down, and were much disappointed at finding a truce of this kind made, and were determined not to go home without something to repay them for the trouble of their march. In consequence, they made an attack upon the *house*[46] of a man named Winter, at a place called the Diamond: it is a meeting of cross-roads, where there are three or four houses. Word was brought to the Protestants, who were on their way home, of what had taken place. They returned to the spot, *attacked* the Defenders, and killed a number of them." The attack was moreover delivered, according to Mr. Blacker, without remonstrance, parley, or warning. The Peep-o'-Day party, he says farther on, "countermarched at once, they returned in haste, and the road led them to the top of this hill that overlooked the part where the Defenders were [as he had heard] at full work, and they *immediately fired on them*" [the Defenders].

Thus, as far as Col. Blacker's evidence goes, (*a*) the Peep-o'-Day Boys made the first *bodily* attack, fired (without warning) the first shots, and drew the first (and apparently the only) blood shed at the Diamond on the 21st September. (*b*) He (or rather his informant) nowhere inculpates the Defenders who were parties to the truce with the violation of it, or with any complicity in the proceedings which subsequently took place at the hamlet of the Diamond on the 21st. (*c*) He does not state, but only surmises or "understands" that the *other* body of Defenders who subsequently came up from a distance (after

[46] No mention is made of attack on any *individual*, but only on a *house*. The nature of the attack is not specified, nor of the injury done (if any), nor of the provocation (if any), or other incidents which led immediately to the alleged attack on this particular house alone in the hamlet. McNevin says (vide *infra*) that, after the preliminary skirmish, when the first body of Defenders had gone home, armed bodies of the Peep-o'-Day party still remained about the Diamond. "M.P." quotes the narrative of an eye-witness, who states that the attack on Winter's house consisted in the breaking of a window.

the first Defenders had gone away), either knew anything of the truce, or deliberately set it aside.[47]

ANOTHER VERSION.

McNevin's account of the affair (published in 1807) runs as follows:

"After this [the first skirmish], in consequence of the interference of a Catholic priest, and of a country gentleman, a truce between both parties was agreed upon, which was unfortunately violated in less than 24 hours. The two bodies that had consented to it for the most part dispersed; the district, however, in which the battle was fought, being entirely filled with Orangemen[48]; some of them still remained embodied, but the Catholics [Defenders] returned home. In the course of the next day, about 700 Defenders from Keady, in a remote part of the county, came to the succour of their friends, and, ignorant of the armistice, attacked the Orangemen who were still assembled. The associates of the latter, being on the spot, quickly collected again, and the Defenders once more were routed. Perhaps this mistake might have been cleared up, and the treaty renewed, if the resentment of the Orangemen had not been fomented and cherished by persons to whom reconciliation of any kind was hateful. The Catholics after this transaction never attempted to make a stand, but the Orangemen commenced a persecution of the blackest dye."[49]

According to Col. Blacker's informants, the Peep-o'-Day party fired the first shots on the 21st of September. The witness was asked. "Was there firing from the other side too?" He replied: "*I believe* there had been, but I do not know of my own knowledge." We have already seen that the chief weapons of the Defender party were pitchforks, etc. If they fired or fought at all, their efforts must have been of a very harmless nature. The engagement, according to our Orange witness, did not last above fifteen minutes. He reached

[47] Col. Verner, in his account of the Diamond affair (Q. 82), makes no mention whatever of the two different bodies of Peep-o'-Day Boys, and thus contrives to leave the wrong impression that the Defenders who had agreed to the truce were the very ones who afterwards violated it. He admits (Q. 108) that his information is altogether from hearsay. Lecky apparently accepts Col. Blacker's version of the Diamond encounter and of the circumstances that led to it, to the utter exclusion of the other authorities referred to above. Several points referred to above regarding the Colonel's evidence, and to his untrustworthiness as a witness, seem to have quite escaped the notice of the distinguished Unionist writer, whose political creed is so much in accord with that of the Orange brethren. *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, iii., 426; cf. p. 421.

[48] See chap. ii., *supra, note* 76.

[49] *Pieces of Irish History*, New York, 1807, pp. 114-115.

the field as the last "dropping shot or two" from the Peep-o'-Day Boys were being fired, and this is what he saw: The Defenders in full flight; the dead bodies of (at most) thirty of their number lying on the field—others were being conveyed away upon carts; *not a Peep-o'-Day Boy that he could hear of was killed, and he mentions no wounded on their side.*[50] Besides their dead, a very large number of Defenders must have been more or less seriously wounded by the "considerable quantity of lead" which our witness had "run into bullets" and conveyed to the Peep-o'-Day Boys of his neighbourhood "*who were going to fight the battle of the Diamond?*"[51]

On the day of this encounter—September 21st, 1795—the first Orange lodge was formed, "in the village of Diamond," as Colonel Verner positively states (Q. 82). His friend, Colonel Blacker, says he "understood it was formed in the house of a man named Sloan, in the village of Loughgall," close to the scene of that day's red strife.

TO SUM UP.

With our present knowledge of the facts surrounding the Diamond Village encounter, the following points may be taken as sufficiently established:

1. The affray took place between Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders.[52]

---

[50]Musgrave, the Orange writer, says that forty-eight Defenders were slain, "and a great number were wounded" (*Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, ed. 1801, vol. i., p. 68.) See also Haverty's *History of Ireland*, p. 731, *note;* Killen's *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, ii., 359.

[51]Is Colonel Blacker tripping here? His whole evidence bears the traces of the verbal revision permitted in such circumstances. Taken literally, the words quoted above would be curiously significant of deliberate preparation for massacre. In another part of his evidence he describes the Peep-o'-Day party from Portadown as suddenly returning from their homeward march, "to fight the battle of the Diamond." Here—if his (evidently revised) statement is to be taken literally—they went "to fight the battle of the Diamond" only after the grim and slow preparation of having large quantities of lead turned into bullets. What he terms "the battle of the Diamond" took place on the 21st of September. In his evidence he carefully distinguishes this from the preliminary skirmishing already described.

[52]See Plowden; McNevin (*Pieces of Irish History*, p. 113); Walpole (*Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 456); Killen (*Eccles Hist. of Ireland*, ii., 359, 363); Miss Martineau's *History of the Peace*: Barry O'Brien (*Thomas Drummond*, and *Fifty Years of Concessions*); Lecky (*Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 216); Froude (*English in Ireland*, iii., 177); Bouverie-Pusey (*The Past History of Ireland*); the evidence of Mr. Christie and of Deputy Grand Chaplain O'Sullivan before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 (see *note* 41, *supra*). There is nothing in the evidence of Cols. Blacker or Verner that can set aside the practically unanimous verdict of every reliable writer of note who has dealt with this subject. The two last-mentioned witnesses use the word "Protestants" instead of "Peep-o'-Day Boys," being, like

2. The Peep-o'-Day Boys' movement, as known in history, was originally an aggressive organisation directed against Catholics. The Defender movement was originally called into existence as an association of defence against the depredations of the Peep-o'-Day Boys. Both associations arose and reached their highest degree of violence in Armagh county, where the Protestant population was numerically, socially, and politically, in a decided ascendency.[53]

3. The events which led up to the "battle" of September 21, 1795, followed upon a period during which there had been a lull in the Defender and Peep-o'-Day disturbances. Our Orange witnesses gave no account of the causes which led to so marked and apparently sudden a change in local feeling, and sent neighbours out to slay each other on the hillsides. Plowden and Christie trace it mainly to certain serious outrages committed on the Catholic minority in and about the districts where the Blackers and the Verners resided, and in which the Diamond is situated.[54] Their accounts are circumstantial and sufficient. Plowden's has been in possession since 1811, and it is in no important particular contradicted either by McNevin or Christie, or our two Orange witnesses.

4. There is no evidence that the first party of (local) Defenders either intended to, or did, disarm any part of the district; or that they took part in what is known as *the* battle of the Diamond; while there is positive evidence—which is nowhere contradicted—that they did not violate the truce entered into on their behalf.

5. There is no evidence to show that the second party of outside Defenders either knew anything of the armistice, or deliberately violated it.[55]

6. The first shots in the encounter of the 21st were evidently fired by the well-armed Peep-o'-Day Boys, and "at sight." There is no evidence to show that the shots were returned, that anything in the nature of a "battle" took place, that any resistance whatever was offered by the Defenders, or that the affair was anything more than a mere slaughter of fugitives. The suspicious one-sidedness of the encounter has led many persons to refer to it as the "massacre" of the Diamond.

"later Orangemen" generally, ashamed of the undoubted connection of their society with the Peep-o'-Day movement. Cf. Lecky's *Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 428 *note*, 444, 445. See chap. iv., *infra*.

[53] See chap. ii., *supra*.

[54] McNevin, whose words have been quoted above, states that the hostilities which led to the Diamond affair were provoked by the Peep-o'-Day Boys.

[55] McNevin, quoted above, states positively that the second party of Defenders were "ignorant of the armistice."

7. The "battle" of the Diamond was not fought for the defence of "the Protestant religion," nor for an "open Bible," nor for the maintenance of the laws or Constitution, nor for any of the principles set forth in the "basis" of the Orange society. These were afterthoughts. "Their [the early Orangemen's] *successors* have added [to the original Orange platform] the principles of the Reformation." So says Grand Chaplain Heathershaw (Victoria), in the course of a lecture on the Orange society, which was reported in the *Victorian Standard* of August 31, 1896.

8. The Diamond encounter and the incidents leading to it, no matter how they may be viewed, afford no justification for the wholesale proscription carried out immediately afterwards against the Catholic minority in Armagh county, or for the enactment of similar scenes in the counties round about; much less for the extension of a somewhat similar policy to the rest of Ireland; less still for the perpetuation of a guerilla warfare against the Catholic body in the British Isles and in the colonies of the Empire down to the present day. In 1837, Lieutenant-Colonel Verner, at an election dinner, gave as a toast, "The Battle of the Diamond." He was sternly reprimanded by Under-Secretary Drummond, and dismissed from the magistracy, for having commemorated such "a lawless and most disgraceful conflict."[56] The matter was ventilated in the House of Commons. The Under-Secretary's action was supported by the House. No one ventured to defend Colonel Verner's toast, and the incident only served to show that, in the opinion of Parliament, it was an indefensible and discreditable proceeding to commemorate such a disgraceful encounter.[57] And yet this was the conflict out of which Orangeism, in its present shape, directly arose. "In commemoration of that [the Diamond] victory," says the Orange historian, Musgrave, "the first Orange lodge was formed in the county Armagh."[58]

[56] Letter to Col. Verner, August 22, 1837, given in full in Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*. See *note* 24, *supra*.

[57] Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. xxxix., pp. 634, 687.

[58] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, vol. i., p. 70, ed. 1801. Colonel Blacker, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, describes the Diamond battle as "the transaction that led to the origin of the Orangemen." Various lodges are named in honour of this "battle," massacre, or faction-fight, as, for instance, the Diamond lodge (No. 62), North Melbourne.

Chapter IV.

PEEP-O'-DAY BOYS, ALIAS ORANGEMEN—AN OATH OF BLOOD—THE INAUGURAL REVELRY OF THE LODGES: "SWORD, FIRE AND FAGGOT; WILL THRESHAM AND JOHN THRUSTOUT"—THE ROLL CALL—THE CHARTER TOAST.

"For the purpose of taking off the stigma of delinquency, the appellation of Peep-o'-Day Boys was changed to Orangemen." So writes Plowden. The *alias* was assumed—if Col. Verner's statement is true—on the blood-stained field of the Diamond.[1]

[1]Musgrave, the Orange historian and apologist, would lead the reader to suppose that the *particular society now under consideration*, bore the name of Orangemen before the battle of the Diamond. His statement is not supported by a scrap of proof, and is contradicted by all the evidence we have regarding its history. Musgrave's *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland* appeared in 1801. The Protestant writer, Lowndes—himself a man of strong sectarian prejudices—describes it as "a party work, abounding in misrepresentations" (*Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*; Bohn, 1857-1864). Webb (a Protestant author) says in his *Compendium of Irish Biography*, (p. 356): "He [Musgrave] displayed such animosity against the Catholics, and outraged public decency so much by his defence of flogging and free-quarters, that, according to a long notice of the work in the *Annual Biography*, 'the Irish Government at length deemed it necessary to disown all connexion with the author, and publicly disclaimed the idea of affording him either patronage or protection in future.'" In the *Cornwallis Correspondence* appears a letter written by Musgrave (November 1st, 1799) to Secretary Cooke, hinting that if a place were secured for him, he would vote for the Legislative Union. His venality was rewarded by his appointment to the lucrative position of Collector of the City of Dublin Excise (Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd. p. 107). Musgrave's *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions* were dedicated to Lord Cornwallis (the Viceroy). On the appearance of the work, Lord Cornwallis (March 24th, 1801) strongly condemned "the contents and nature of the work," and repudiated the dedication. His communication to Musgrave is given by Plowden, *loc. cit.*, p. 108. Sir Jonah Barrington, in his *Personal Sketches*, says of Musgrave that he was "generally in his senses" "except on the abstract topics of politics, religion, martial-law, his wife, the Pope, the Pretender, the Jesuits, Napper Tandy, and the whipping-post." Plowden describes his *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions* as "an undigested heap of acrimonious falsehood and obloquy" (*Ireland from its Union*, vol i., p. 107). Lecky refers in strong terms to Musgrave's "usual violent and evident partisanship" (*Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, iv., 457, *note*), to his "malevolent partiality" (*ibid.*, v., 55), and (iii., 286,

This favourite device of the wrongdoer was not inappropriate in the present instance, as the extent of the slaughter might naturally be expected to rouse even the partisan Government of the day from its state of masterly inaction with regard to the doings of the rival factions in Armagh. The change of name, however,

1. Brought no change in the membership of the association;

2. It brought no such alteration in its guiding principles or methods of action as would constitute it a new association. All the characteristic features of the Peep-o'-Day association - raiding for arms, house-wrecking, plundering, etc.—continued without intermission, but on a vaster scale and in a more thorough-going fashion than before. This was effected by the institution of the lodge system, which was originated on the night of the Diamond affair. It linked together into a united and formidable whole the hitherto scattered or loosely knit units of the Peep-o'-Day association. Briefly: Orangeism and Peep-o'-Dayism had the same membership, the same principles and conduct. They differed in certain details of organisation, and in the extent of their depredations.

In his examination before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, Mr. Christie, a venerable member of the Society of Friends, who was born in 1771, and was an eye-witness of what he relates, says that the Break-of-Day party merged into Orangemen[2]; as far as he knew, the title "Break-o'-Day [or Peep-o'-Day] Boys" "completely subsided" after the formation of the Orange society. "I never heard it," said he, "applied to any people after the Orangemen had lodges, as they termed it." The early Orangemen, he added, were of the same class as the Break-o'-Day Men. "The same people," said he, "that made use of intemperate language towards the Catholics whilst the Break-o'-Day business existed were the same people that I saw afterwards walking in the Orange processions."[3] Plowden, a contemporary historian, describes the Orange institution as "but an extension of the society of Peep-o'-Day Boys."[4] Mr. Sinclair, a Church of England magistrate of Tyrone county, who remembered the time of the battle of the Diamond, deposed on oath before

---

note) says that he "represents the extreme anti-Catholic spirit produced by the rebellion of 1798." Rev. James Gordon, the Protestant historian of that rebellion, in the second edition of his work, uncompromisingly exposes the unreliability of Musgrave's *Memoirs*. Gordon frankly admits his own partiality for his creed and political party, and states in the preface to his second edition (p. x) that his sons were Orangemen.

[2] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5576-7. Cf. chap. iii., *supra*, *note* 41.

[3] *Ibid*, Qq. 5165, 5578.

[4] *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 85.

the Select Committee of 1835 that he always understood the Peep-o'-Day Boys to have merged into the Orange association.[5] Even Col. Verner admitted to the Select Committee of 1835, that, after the formation of the Orange society, the Peep-o'-Day Boys did not continue as such.[6] "On that day" [of the battle of the Diamond], says Plowden, "the Peep-o'-Day Boys dropt that appellation, and assumed the denomination of Orangemen; and then was their first lodge formed."[7] According to the testimony of Deputy Grand Chaplain Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, referred to above[8], the factions who opposed each other in the *first* encounter of the Diamond were the Defenders and the Peep-o'-Day Boys; while Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker, as we have seen, distinctly states that it was the same body of Protestants who fought at the Diamond in *both* engagements with the Defenders. Plowden points out "that as late as 1799, the Irish Grand Lodge adopted the following rule (the fifth of the 'Secret Articles'), which is characteristic of the Peep-o'-Day movement: 'We are not to carry away any money, goods, or anything else from any person whatsoever, *except arms and ammunition*, and those *only from an enemy*.'"[9] McNevin in his *Pieces of Irish History* (p. 113) states that the Peep-o'-Day Boys "adopted the name of Orangemen." He regards the two associations as identical, and in common with many other writers, frequently applies the name "Orangemen" to the Peep-o'-Day Boys.[10] William Sampson, an Ulster Protestant and barrister, another contemporary witness, in one of his speeches, given by Madden,[11] refers to the oaths "of those called 'Peep-o'-Day Boys,' afterwards 'Orangemen.'" In November, 1796, Bernard Coile, of Lurgan, presented a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant. In the course of that document he referred to his efforts in "promoting the printed resolutions of the Roman Catholics of his and the adjoining parish, and enforcing by all his influence the observance of these resolutions, in hopes, by setting an example, of goodwill and moderation, to disarm the animosity of a faction denominated Peep-o'-Day Boys, *and since called Orangemen*, whose only object was the persecution of the Catholics."[12] A

[5] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5165.

[6] *Ibid*, Q. 161.

[7] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 19; cf. his *Historical Review*, vol. ii., p. 539, ed. 1803.

[8] Chap. iii., *note* 41.

[9] The rules of 1799-1800 are given in full in Plowden's *History of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., after Introduction; also in Appendix to *Third Report* of Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835.

[10] See chap. ii., *supra*, *note* 76.

[11] *United Irishmen*, Second Series, vol. ii., p. 378.

[12] This document is given in Plowden, and in "M.P.'s" *History of Orange-*

work published in 1797, and which, according to Lecky, was "written with considerable knowledge," details the proceedings of "a party of Orangemen *having assumed this new* designation."[13]

SOME LATER WRITERS.

In his *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*,[14] the Protestant historian, Lecky, says: "At first, as we have seen, Orangeism was simply a form of outrage—the Protestant side of the faction which had long been raging in certain counties of the North among the tenants and labourers of the two religions—and the Protestants in Armagh being considerably stronger than the Catholics, Orangeism in that county had assumed the character of a most formidable persecution." In another part of the same work he states that "the Orange disturbances" in Ulster, in 1795 and 1796, "were a *continuation* or revival of the war between the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the Defenders,"[15] and that "the Peep-o'-Day Boys ultimately merged into Orangemen."[16] He points out that "the *later* Orangemen have been extremely anxious to disclaim all connection with the outrages of 1795 and 1796, which they attribute to the Peep-o'-Day Boys;" but he adds, "on the other hand, the depredators called themselves, and were called by others, Orangemen, and the Peep-o'-Day Boys *rapidly merged into Orangemen, and ceased to exist as a separate body*."[17] Mr. Bouverie-Pusey, who describes himself as a Protestant of strong convictions, writes: "We have spoken before of the 'Peep-o'Day Boys' and the 'Defenders.' At this juncture *the former, now called Orangemen*, were employed in expelling every Catholic in three or four of the Ulster counties."[18] A similar account of the connection between the two associations—or rather, between two phases in the development of the same association—is given by the writer of the article on "Orangemen" in *Chambers' Encyclopædia* (ed. 1865). Killen also takes it for granted that the early Orangemen were simply Peep-o'-Day Boys under a "new designation."[19] Barry O'Brien, in his *Fifty Years of Concessions*

---

ism, pp. 53-54. The purport of the resolutions referred to is given in chap. iii., *supra*.

[13] *A View of the Present State of Ireland, and of the Disturbances in that Country*, quoted by Madden, *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., Appendix 5, p. 331. See chap. ii., *note* 68, *supra*, p. 28.

[14] Vol. iv., p. 47.

[15] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 445.

[16] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 511.

[17] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 429, *note*.

[18] *The Past History of Ireland*, p. 106.

[19] *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 360.

to Ireland,[20] describes Orangeism as "the final development of the Peep-o'-Day Boys' movement." Rev. William Nassau Molesworth, a Church of England clergyman, says in his well known work that the Orange society "gradually took the place of another Protestant confederacy, the members of which were called Break-of-Day Men."[21] It would be easy to multiply quotations to the same effect from the works of both Protestant and Catholic writers.

"AN ATROCIOUS BANDITTI."

We have already seen, from the evidence of our old Quaker friend, Mr. Christie, who was an eye-witness of what he relates, that the same class that had previously been Peep-o'-Day Boys were precisely those who swelled the ranks of the organisation after it had assumed the title of Orange. In a previous chapter I have shown that the Peep-o'-Day Boys were recruited from the lowest class of Protestants. It will follow from what has been said that the rank and file of the early Orangemen likewise belonged to the lower strata of society. Musgrave, the Orange historian and apologist, grants

---

[20] Chap. v., p. 115.

[21] *History of England from the Year 1830-1874*, vol. i., p. 376: Against this practically unanimous finding of competent authorities, it has been urged that the Peep-o'-Day Boys were Presbyterians, while the first Orangemen were exclusively Episcopalians. To this we reply: 1. Many Presbyterians joined the Peep-o'-Day movement, especially in the counties of Cavan, Down, etc., but the association was nowhere exclusively Presbyterian. 2. The Presbyterians who had become Peep-o'-Day Boys were reconciled to the Defenders in the middle of 1792, more than three years before the battle of the Diamond (*Memoirs of Theobald Wolfe Tone*, i., 97; ii., 392). 3. According to Killen (ii., 356), the first Peep-o'-Day Boys who began the plunder and wrecking of Catholic houses were "Protestants of the Established Church." Musgrave admits that Lurgan and its vicinity "abounds with Protestants of the Established Church." *Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 55. 4. Armagh was the most Episcopalian county in Ireland (see chap. ii., *supra*, p. 23). Plowden states that the Armagh Peep-o'-Day Boys were largely members of the State Church—he habitually uses the word "Protestant" in this sense. (*Ireland from its Union*, Introd., p. 9; cf. chap. v., *infra*). Atkinson, the leader, and the Blackers, the abettors, of the Peep-o'-Day Boys who fought at the Diamond, all belonged to the Established Church. The rank-and-file of their followers also evidently did; (*a*) because Col. Blacker, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, described them as "Protestants," a word commonly used then, and even still, in Ireland, to distinguish Episcopalians from Presbyterians (see this chapter, *infra*); (*b*) because the first Orange lodge, formed "to commemorate that victory" was composed exclusively of members of the State creed: it is unlikely that Anglicans would thus celebrate a victory won by Presbyterians, and exclude the latter from such celebration; (*c*) Musgrave, the Orange writer, says that "the lower class of *Protestants of the Established Church* stood forward at this perilous time" —the period of the Diamond affray (*Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 69. See chap. iii. *note* 52, *supra*. Cf. chap. v., *infra*). See Irish *Report*, Q. 4089.

so much. Writing of the Diamond period, he says that "the lower class of Protestants of the Established Church stood forward at this perilous time."[22] The Protestant statesman, Grattan, in his oft-quoted speech to the Irish Parliament on the early Orange outrages, describes the brethren as "a banditti of murderers," "a violent mob," "an atrocious banditti."[23] Lord Gosford (a Protestant, and Governor of the county of Armagh, where they first arose), calls them "a lawless banditti," "an ungovernable mob." The well-informed contemporary author of *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1797), quoted above, includes both Peep-o'-Day Boys and Orangemen under the sweeping title of "a banditti of plundering ruffians." Plowden states that the small proportion of Presbyterians who were sworn into the Orange society were "chiefly of the lower orders," and that "few, if any Presbyterians of independence entered the [Orange] societies."[24]

Killen, the Presbyterian historian, says: "Nothing can be more evident than that the original Orangemen were the very scum of society, and a disgrace to Protestantism."[25] Lecky,

---

[22] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, vol. i., p. 69, ed. 1801.

[23] This speech is given in Killen (vol. ii., pp. 364, 365); and in full in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 46-49.

[24] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 66. Cf. chap. v. *infra*.

[25] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 359, *note*; cf. p. 363. Froude has been apparently understood by some to say that the *original* Orangemen were "all that was best and noblest in Ireland." But even Froude does not commit himself to such a daring statement. His words are: "The same evening [of the battle of the Diamond] was established the first lodge of an institution which was to gather into it *in succeeding years* all that was best and noblest in Ireland" *(English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 177, ed. 1877). Subsequent chapters of this publication will show how far this statement is in accord with fact. On the very same page (177) Froude refers to the Diamond as "a village in *Tyrone*." Lecky says that this work of Froude's *(The English in Ireland)* "*is intended to blacken to the utmost the character of the Irish people, and especially of the Irish Catholics*" *(Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 13, *note*. Cf. pp. 46, 307, 375, 376, 378, etc.). Lecky has also said of this work of Froude's: "*His book* [*The English in Ireland*] *has no more claim to impartiality than an election squib*" (quoted by Justin H. McCarthy in his *Outlines of Irish History*, p. 78). Judge Morris, in his valuable work, *Ireland*: 1642-1868, (Cambridge: University Press, 1896) dismisses Froude's *English in Ireland* with the brief remark: "This must be called a bad book." Froude, in the work of his here referred to, states that the rebels on their march to Arklow, in 1798, "*halted at every mile to hear Mass*" (iii., 480)! This author's deep-seated antipathy to Catholics so affected his every statement regarding them, that, as a reviewer says, he "leaves us hopelessly struggling to distinguish between his history and his hysteria" (*Athenæum*, February 22, 1896). This is the number which described him as "a fashionable preacher gone wrong"). For fuller and more detailed proof of his hopeless unreliability as a historian, the reader is referred to W. A. O'Conor's *History of the Irish People*, vol. ii., pp. 180-187; Father Burke's *Lectures*; to Prendergast's *Cromwellian Settle-*

in his *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, thus refers to the membership of the early Orange movement: "The upper classes at first generally held aloof from the society"; "*for a considerable time* it appears to have been almost confined [like the Peep-o'-Day movement] to the Protestant peasantry of Ulster."[26] "It was," says he again, "a popular and democratic movement, *springing up among the lowest classes, and essentially lawless*."[27] What he terms "the Orange disturbances in Ulster," were begun "*after the battle of the Diamond* by the Protestant *rabble* of the county of Armagh."[28] Elsewhere[29] he describes them as a "tumultuous rabble," and refers to the spirit of bigotry which animated them.[30] The writer of the article on "Orangemen" in *Chambers' Encyclopædia* (eds. 1865, 1879) says that the association "began among the ignorant peasantry." The society, which, left to itself, might have gone the way of the Whiteboys, the Hearts of Oak, the Hearts of Steel, etc., received a fresh lease of life from the use which Pitt made of it in effecting the great project of his later policy —the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. In days of peace, or with a united people, such a project was sure to end in failure. Disunion was a condition essential to success and an unsuccessful rebellion, highly favourable to it. The reader will learn, as we proceed, a few of the sad details of the manner in which the Orange party carried out the hateful work of setting creed against creed, and of goading the unhappy people into insurrection. Under the favouring smile of a friendly Government, the worst crimes of the "banditti of plundering ruffians" were either connived at or openly

---

ment; to Mitchel's 1641: *Reply to the Falsification of History by James Anthony Froude* (Glasgow, Cameron and Ferguson); Killen's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (ii., 357, etc.); the strictures of Professor Goldwin Smith and others on his *Henry VIII.* (e.g. in the *North American Review* for December, 1894); the strong and general condemnation of his *Lectures on the Council of Trent* (e.g. *Athenæum*, April 11, 1896, and *Dublin Review*, October, 1896). See, especially, the article in the *Contemporary Review* for March, 1878, in which the distinguished scholar, Dr. Freeman (Regius Professor of History, Oxford University), exposes, in scathing fashion, Froude's "fanatical hatred" of the Catholic Church, his "constant inaccuracy of reference and quotation," his "endless displays of ignorance," and—to use no stronger term— his general historical blundering and thoroughgoing unreliability.

[26] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 428. Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, in his *History of England* (vol. i., p. 376), says: "At first the Orangemen all belonged to the lower orders."

[27] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., pp. 47-48.

[28] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., pp. 429, 445.

[29] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 54.

[30] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., pp. 428, 429. The narrative of the early Orange outrages occupies pp. 429-446.

encouraged by Acts of Indemnity. Henceforth—till Pitt's policy was effected—the way to favour, place, and power lay through religious strife and persecution. In spite of what Killen terms "its discreditable origin," persons in the higher walks of society joined the ranks of the Orange organisation in 1797, and still more in 1798, and the work of forcing the people into insurrection went merrily on.[31]

AN OATH OF BLOOD.

The early Orange society was, as we have seen, simply the Peep-o'-Day association with a new name and a more complete organisation. Its character may be gauged from that of the class who filled its ranks, but still more from the wild orgie of violence, plunder, outrage, and proscription with which the reign of Orangeism was inaugurated. Plowden gives the following, on the authority of others, as the original oath of the Orangemen:

"I, A.B., do swear that I will be true to King and Government, and that *I will exterminate the Catholics of Ireland, as far as lies in my power.*"[32]

Killen, the Presbyterian historian, says: "The accuracy of this representation has been denied; but there are strong grounds for believing that it is substantially true; and the conduct of the Orangemen during the first year of their existence under the new designation, abundantly justified the suspicion that they had entered into some such horrid compact."[33] The evidence for the existence of an oath of extermination against Catholics may be summarily stated as follows:

1. Bernard Coile, of Lurgan (county of Armagh), declared to the Irish Under-Secretary, Cooke, that such an oath was taken.[34]

2. Bernard Cush, of the 5th Dragoons, swore before a

---

[31] Compare Killen, *Eccles Hist. of Ireland*, ii., 365, 367. Lecky distinguishes between the earlier and "the later Orangemen" (iii., 428, *note*); and says (p. 448) that it was "at a later period" that the country gentry joined its numbers. The noted Orange family of the Beresfords, and their connections and dependents, are said to have held at least one-fourth of all the positions in Ireland (Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 273-274). The accession of the gentry in no wise changed the violent character of the society (*Ibid.*, iv. 49).

[32] *Historical Review of the state of Ireland*, vol. ii., part i., p. 537; *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 54. The dedication of both these works was accepted by the then Prince of Wales.

[33] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 359, 360.

[34] Plowden's *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 58. Killen describes Coile as "a respectable Roman Catholic merchant of Lurgan, against whose life a conspiracy had been formed" (ii., 361, *note*).

magistrate, and also deposed on oath before Under-Secretary Cooke at Dublin Castle, "not only that such was the form of the Orangeman's oath, which was tendered to him, and which he refused to swear, but which five others concerned in the conspiracy had actually subscribed to in his presence."[35]

3. In the course of the examination of Arthur O'Connor (a Protestant) before the Committee of the Commons, August 16, 1798, the witness referred to the countenance shown by Government to the fanaticism of the Orangemen. One of the Committee replied: "Government had nothing to do with the Orange system, *nor their oath of extermination.*" O'Connor rejoined: "You, my Lord [Castlereagh], from the station you fill, must be sensible that the Executive of any country has it in its power to collect a vast mass of information; and you must know from the secret nature and the zeal of the Union, that its Executive must have the most minute information of every act of the Irish Government. As one of the Executive, it came to my knowledge that considerable sums of money were expended throughout the nation in endeavouring to extend the Orange system, and that *the Orange oath of extermination was administered.* When these facts are coupled, not only with the general impunity which has been uniformly extended towards all the acts of this infernal association, but the marked encouragement its members have received from Government, I find it impossible to exculpate the Government from being the parent and protector of these *sworn extirpators.*"[36] In this challenge to Lord Castlereagh, O'Connor takes it for granted that the Irish Government was fully cognisant of the Orange oath of extermination. The remark of a member of the Committee, quoted above, implies such knowledge on their part. This supposition is still further strengthened by the fact that the witness's positive statements on the subject were allowed to pass uncontradicted by the very member of the Committee whom they most concerned, and to whom they were pointedly and defiantly directed—namely, Lord Castlereagh. In the thirteenth chapter of this volume the reader will find abundant evidence of the truth of the statements made by O'Connor regarding the alliance between the Government and the Orange society.

4. The authoritative contemporary pamphlet already referred to—*A View of the Present State of Ireland*—published in 1797, gives the following as the form of early Orange "purple" oath: "In the awful presence of Almighty God, I, A.B., do solemnly swear that I will, to the utmost of my

[35] Plowden, *loc. cit.*

[36] Madden, *United Irishmen*, Second Series, vol. ii., p. 320.

power, support the King and the present Government; and I do further swear that I will use my utmost exertions to *exterminate all the Catholics in the kingdom of Ireland.*"[37]

5. William Sampson, an Ulster Protestant barrister, in his *Memoirs* (published in 1807), gives also what he terms the "purple oath" of extermination, which, he says, was taken by the early Orangemen.[38] In a speech, delivered at Philadelphia, he refers to the "exterminating oaths" of the Orangemen.[39]

The reader who takes an interest in this grim subject may find, in the following words of contemporary authorities, evidence corroborative of what has been stated above:

6. About three months after the battle of the Diamond, Lord Gosford, Protestant Governor of this same county of Armagh, wrote to Secretary Pelham regarding the outrages of the early Orangemen. In the course of his letter he says: "The Protestant and Catholic inhabitants were inflamed to the highest pitch of animosity; but the former were greatly superior in strength, and made no scruple of declaring, both *by words and actions that could not be misunderstood, a fixed intention to exterminate their opponents.*" The writer is referring to the month of October, 1795, a few weeks after the formation of the first Orange lodge.[40]

7. Brigadier-General Knox was an Ulster Protestant, and,

---

[37]Quoted by Plowden, *Historical Review*, vol. ii., p. 537, ed. 1803. The author of the pamphlet referred to above was, according to Madden, an Ulster magistrate. See chap. iii., *supra*, *note* 68.

[38]Sampson, though professionally, as barrister, in the secrets of the United Association, was not a regular sworn member (Madden's *United Irishmen*, Second Series, pp. 348-349, 358). He also gives an "amended oath," attributed to Thomas Verner, which concludes as follows: "that I will not make, or be at the making of a Roman Catholic an Orangeman, or give him any offence, *unless he offends me, and then I will use my endeavours to shed the last drop of his blood.*" The conclusion of the "amended test" runs as follows:

"Can you write your name? I can.

"With what sort of a pen? With the spear of life, or Aaron's rod, that buds, blossoms, and bears almonds in one night.

"With what sort of ink? *Papist blood.*"

[39]Madden, *United Irishmen*, Second Series, vol. ii., p. 378.

[40]Quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 431, *note*. The fifth rule of *The early Ordinances of the Armagh Orangemen* (printed in 1801 by King, of Westmoreland Street, Dublin) concludes as follows:

"Our first principle, shall be, therefore, an open Bible, at the 68th Psalm thereof, and the second, a short notice and a sure coming to all our enemies." The 68th Psalm contains the following verse: "*That thy foot may be dipped in the blood of thine enemies, and the tongue of thy dogs in the same.*" Rule 4 of the same pamphlet binds the brethren to "defend an Orangeman against the *insult* of a Papist *with the last drop of his blood.*" Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 81. Cf. *note* 38, *supra*.

like Lord Gosford, was resident in that province during the early days of the Orange association. Writing to the Chief-Secretary in May, 1797, he says: "The Orangemen were originally a bigoted set of men, *who were ready to destroy the Roman Catholics*."[41]

8. We may quote in this connection the significant words written by the distinguished contemporary Protestant nobleman, Lord Holland, in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party*. Describing the various methods by which the unhappy Catholic people were goaded into the insurrection of 1798, he says of the courts-martial of the period: "It often happened that three officers composed the court, and that of the three two were under age, and the third, an officer of the yeomanry or militia, who *had sworn in his Orange lodge eternal hatred* to the people [Catholics], over whom he was thus constituted as judge."[42]

9. Plowden, in his *Ireland from its Union*,[43] tells how Giffard, the father of the Orange system, declared, in the presence of five well-known persons, whose names are given, that "he would forgive Cromwell everything but one thing"—"his not having exterminated the Catholics from Ireland, and concluded with the most solemn avowal of his own efficient and most ardent wishes to effectuate that object." In a letter concerning the Ascendency faction, which guided the policy of the lodges in 1798, the Marquis Cornwallis says: "Their conversation and conduct points to no other way of concluding this unhappy business [the rebellion] than that of extirpation;" and, again, that they "would pursue measures that could only terminate in the extirpation of the greater number of the inhabitants, and in the utter destruction of the country."[44] Since that period occasional isolated cries for the extermination of the Irish Catholics have gone up from the mouths of members of the Orange fraternity. Of the instances which have come under my notice, it will suffice to mention two, the one a voice from Ulster, the other an echo from Victoria. According to the Right Hon. Lalor Shiel, such a cry was raised in 1826 by a Rev. Dr. Robinson at an

---

[41] Quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 50, 55.

[42] *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i., p. 113, ed. 1852. In a work before me I find the words given in italics above quoted as follows: "had sworn in his Orange lodge to *exterminate* the people," etc. The words may possibly be given thus in another edition of the *Memoirs*, that of 1852 being the only one which I have been able to consult.

[43] Vol. i., Introd., pp. 21-22.

[44] Cornwallis *Correspondence*, vol. ii., p. 358; cf. pp. 355, 360, 369, 377. Murray's ed., 1859.

Orange meeting at Omagh, the proceedings of which were subsequently published in the form of an authorised pamphlet. "In the spirit of ferocious honesty," says Shiel, who had read the pamphlet, "and with a bloodthirsty candour, he has openly acknowledged that he and his party long for a general massacre, and aspire at a universal extirpation of the Roman Catholics of Ireland."[45] Equally frank expression was given to a similar wish by Brother E. Harkness at the Maryborough (Victoria) Orange demonstration of 1887. Referring to the Irish Catholics the speaker said that "the Orangemen *only wanted to be let loose, and they would exterminate them.*"[46]

10. Grattan, another Protestant contemporary witness, in his oft-quoted speech, delivered in the Irish House of Commons on February 21, 1796, declared that "the object of the Orangemen was *the extermination of all the Catholics*" of the county of Armagh, and that they (the Orangemen) "had proceeded from robbery and murder to *extermination.*" The *Dublin Evening Post*, of September 24, of the same year, 1796, described the Orange party (whose Reign of Terror was still in full progress in the North) as "furious hordes, armed with sword, fire, and faggot, to *exterminate a people.*"[47]

The reader will observe that the authorities quoted in this connection are—(*a*) all contemporary with the rise and early progress of Orangeism; that (*b*) they are of various creeds and classes; and that (*c*) they either directly state that the oath of extermination was taken by the early Orangemen, or that the main purpose of the early Orangemen was the extirpation of Catholics. Lecky, in the fourth volume of his *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, proves how general and widespread, in every part of Ireland, was the belief that the Orangemen took the oath of extermination, as given above by Plowden.[48] Add to this the fact that the character and conduct of the rude and criminal pioneers of the Orange association was quite in keeping with a sworn compact of this nature. It is only fair to state, with Lecky, that "*at a later period*," when persons of high social standing were drawn into membership of the society, they denied having taken the oath of extermination.[49] I can find no evidence that this oath has been repu-

[45] *Speeches*, second ed., 1868, pp. 378, 383.

[46] *Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser*, July 13, 1887. Harkness resided at Maryborough. His remarks evoked some comment at the time, but the correctness of the report seems never to have been called in question. The reporter, who is an accomplished pressman, and still a highly respected resident of Maryborough, personally vouches for the accuracy of the words quoted above from Harkness's speech.

[47] Quoted by "M.P.'s" *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 44.

[48] See, for instance, p. 126; cf. pp. 136, 268, 347, 381.

[49] The Dublin Orangemen issued a solemn manifesto in 1797, through

diated by the first Orangemen or their leaders. The reader can judge for himself how far this denial by one class of brethren of a later day will outweigh the cumulative force of the body of contemporary testimony given above.

WAS IT DEFENSIVE?

The statement has been frequently made that the early Orange organisation was altogether of a defensive character.[50] The facts of the case may be briefly stated as follow:

---

the press, as a reply to the "slanders" etc., which had been spread abroad "to poison the public mind" against them. Now, the head and front of all the crimes constantly imputed to them, ever since their foundation in 1795, had been the taking of the oath to "exterminate the Catholics of Ireland." The manifesto contains no express denial that the oath of extermination was taken even then (in 1797), while it refrains altogether from mention of the early members of the institution. In any case, repudiation of the oath in question must be taken in connection with one constant element in the policy of this secret association: namely, the denial, on occasion, of even the notorious official proceedings of the society. I have already referred to Deputy Grand Master Blacker's garbling of the oath of conditional loyalty. Compare the statements of the Earl of Enniskillen, in the sixth chapter, regarding secret signs, pass-words, etc., and, in the fifteenth chapter, the persistent denials, by the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Kenyon, and others, of facts with which they were personally mixed up in connection with the illegal formation of Orange lodges in the army. The manifesto in question makes professions of kindly feeling towards Catholics which were flatly contradicted by the current facts of Orange history, and later on, in 1835, by the official evidence of Deputy Grand Secretary Swan, to which reference will be made in the next chapter. The manifesto referred to is given in full in Mitchel's *History of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxxii., and in Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 77-79. The early rules of the association were not laid before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, although they were called for, and were admitted to be at the time in the possession of Deputy Grand Master Col. Verner, who was himself a member of the Committee. We may fairly assume that Col. Verner had sufficiently grave reasons for withholding those early rules from even the eyes of a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into the Orange system.

[50] Lecky says (iii., 429, 448) that the society as "*originally founded*," and "*in its first conception*," was defensive. This is a virtual admission that *after* what he terms its "*original* foundation"—at the Battle of the Diamond—it ceased to be defensive. The reader will note the following points in Lecky's account of early Orangeism (iii., 426-446):

(*a*) He nowhere states the nature of the alleged defensive purpose, nor gives any evidence that the society, as founded at the Diamond or Loughgall, was "essentially defensive." (*b*) Anyone reading his account of what he and Froude term "the Orange disturbances" in Ulster, will see that *he regards the conduct of the early Orangemen as distinctly aggressive* (cf. Froude's *English in Ireland*, iii., 197; Lecky, iii., 445). Lecky (quoted above) admits that "*at first* Orangeism was simply *a form of outrage*," and was "*essentially lawless*" (iv., 47-48); that the persecution of the Catholics by the early Orangemen was "of a most formidable" character (47); and that it began "*immediately* after the battle of the Diamond" and the first foundation of Orange lodges (iii., 429.) Lecky is, like the Orangemen, a strong Unionist in politics.

1. We have already seen that Orangeism in its early form —the Peep-o'-Day movement—was distinctly aggressive. Its illegal depredations, coupled with the criminal partiality of the magistracy, provoked the formation of the (originally, at least) defensive organisation of the Defenders. There is no evidence to show that, at any period, the Armagh Peep-o'-Day Boys became a purely defensive association.

2. Evidence has already been adduced to show that the events which led to the Diamond affray were provoked by the outrages of the Peep-o'-Day Boys and their sympathisers in and about Portadown.

3. There is no evidence to show that, after the battle of the Diamond, the originally aggressive Peep-o'-Day movement suddenly changed its character, and became simply an association for self-defence. Such a supposition is, *a priori*, unlikely; it is, moreover, opposed to the known facts of Orange history.

(a) The easy and (to them) bloodless victory of the Diamond, was a signal proof of the deadly superiority of the Peep-o'-Day Boys in physical strength over even large bodies of their ill-armed and leaderless opponents. This made a new and wholly defensive organisation less necessary, and an aggressive policy more secure and inviting, than ever.

(b) The early Orangemen were (as Lord Gosford, Governor of Armagh, said, and as the events proved) "greatly superior in strength," not alone to the Defenders, but to the Catholics of the county or districts generally.[51]

(c) After the battle of the Diamond, says Lecky,[52] "the rioters met with scarcely any resistance or disturbance" in their work of plundering, persecuting, and banishing the Catholic population of the county of Armagh. McNevin says that "the Catholics after this transaction [the battle of the Diamond] never attempted to make a stand, but the Orangemen commenced a persecution of the blackest die."[53] The same is implied in Lord Gosford's address to the magistrates of Armagh county, December 28th, 1795 (three months after the Diamond affair), where he says that "*the only crime*" of the victims of

---

Rev. James Gordon, a Protestant contemporary writer, whose sons were Orangemen, and whose *History of the Rebellion* was published in 1801, reverses the contention of Lecky. He says (vol. ii., p. 358) that the *later* or "*improved* system" of Orangeism was "purely defensive," and implies that "the outrages of the *original* Orangemen" showed that their association was an aggressive one.

[51] Lord Gosford's letter to Pelham, quoted by Lecky, vol. iii., p. 431, *note*.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 429.

[53] *Pieces of Irish History*, pp. 114, 115.

this inaugural Orange persecution was "simply a profession of the Roman Catholic faith."

(d) The undoubted facts of history show that the early Orange association, from the first day of its existence under the new designation, was of a distinctly aggressive character. This is proved by the whole course of its early policy towards the Catholic body, which may be briefly summed up as follows: (1) terrorising by threatening notices; (2) house-wrecking, house-burning, and other forms of destruction of the property of Catholics; (3) plundering and confiscation; (4) depriving Catholic labourers and artisans of employment; (5) wholesale banishment of Catholics; (6) murder; (7) outlawing, or depriving Catholics of their civil rights. Be it noted that this policy of the early Orange lodges was (1) carried out systematically; (2) *against an unresisting minority of the population* of Armagh county; (3) on a vast scale; and (4) for a considerable period. What has come to be known as the Orange Reign of Terror *began with the foundation of the first lodge* in 1795. This first phase of "the Orange disturbances," with which alone we are at present concerned, continued till 1797. This was succeeded by the systematic and still more cruel persecution and torture of the unhappy people, for the purpose of provoking the ill-fated insurrection which broke out in 1798. With this later phase of the Reign of Terror of the lodges I shall deal in the thirteenth chapter, when treating of the "gallant Orange yeomanry."[54]

THE REIGN OF TERROR.

Lecky, in his description of "the Orange disturbances in Ulster," says that "a terrible persecution of the Catholics *immediately* followed" the battle of the Diamond, and that "the Protestant rabble in the county of Armagh, and of part of the

[54]Some apologists of the Orange society represent it as having been founded to combat the United Irishmen as well as the Defenders. The statement is utterly void of foundation. (*a*) The Defender movement was long hostile to the United Irishmen and non-political (Lecky *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 223). (*b*) In 1795, the year of the foundation of the lodges, the Government, after the most careful inquiry, failed to find any connection whatsoever between the Defenders and the United Irishmen (*op. cit.* p. 387). (*c*) The Defender movement did not merge into the United Irish society till 1796 (Madden, *United Irishmen*; Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 486; McNevin, pp. 117, 121). (*d*) Rev. Holt Waring deposed before the Select Committee of the House of Lords that the United Irish society was not established in Armagh county (where Orangeism arose) until *after the starting of Orangeism*. (*e*) Rev. Holt Warring's testimony is practically corroborated by the *Memoir* drawn up for the Government by Emmet, O'Connor, and McNevin, who point out that the Armagh atrocities first drove the Catholics in great numbers into the ranks of the United Irishmen (quoted in chap. ii., *supra*, *note* 54, p. 26).

adjoining counties, determined by continuous outrages to drive the Catholics from the country."[55] I shall let Protestant contemporary authorities describe the chief phases of the long-drawn inaugural fury of the Orange lodges. The reader will then be in a position to judge for himself how hopelessly inconsistent the conduct of early Orangeism is with the idea of a movement that was altogether, or even mainly, of a defensive character.

On the 28th of December, 1795, about three months after what we shall agree to call the "battle" of the Diamond, some thirty of the leading magistrates and grand jurors of the county of Armagh attended, upon summons of the Governor, the Earl of Gosford (a Protestant nobleman), to consider the state of the country. In the opening sentence of his address, Lord Gosford said he had called them together to devise a plan "to check the calamities that have already brought disgrace upon this country." He then proceeds: "It is no secret that a persecution, accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty which have in all ages distinguished that dreadful calamity, is now raging in this county [Armagh]. Neither age, nor sex, *nor even acknowledged innocence* as to the late disturbances, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection. The only crime which the wretched objects of this merciless persecution are charged with is a crime of easy proof: *It is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic faith.* A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this species of delinquency, and the sentence they pronounced is equally concise and terrible: *It is nothing less than a confiscation of all property and immediate banishment.* It would be extremely painful, and surely unnecessary, to detail all the horrors that attended the execution of *so wide and tremendous a proscription, that certainly exceeds, in the comparative number of those it consigns to ruin and misery, every example that ancient and modern history can afford.* For where have we heard, and in what history of human cruelties have we read, of more than half the inhabitants of a populous county being deprived at one blow of the means, as well as the fruits, of their industry, and driven, *in the midst of an inclement winter,* to seek a shelter for themselves and their helpless families where chance may guide them? This is no exaggerated picture of the horrid scenes now acting in this county. Yet, surely, it is sufficient to awaken sentiments of

[55] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,* vol. iii., p. 429. Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, quoted in a previous chapter, states that the object of the early Orangemen was "to drive the Catholics out of the northern counties of Ireland by wrecking and destroying their houses." *Hist. of England,* vol. i., p. 376.

indignation and compassion in the coldest bosoms. These horrors are now acting, and acting with impunity. *The spirit of impartial justice*, without which law is nothing better than tyranny, *has for a time disappeared in this county*, and the supineness of the magistracy of this county is a topic of conversation in every corner of this kingdom."[56]

"This terrible picture," says Lecky, "appears to have been fully acquiesced in by the assembled gentlemen."[57] Resolutions were unanimously carried to the effect "that the county of Armagh is at this moment in a state of no common disorder," and that the Catholics residing there were "grievously oppressed by lawless persons unknown, who attack and plunder their houses by night, *unless they immediately abandon their lands and habitations*." This resolution was signed by Lord Gosford and by twenty-three Armagh county magistrates, of whom twenty-two were Protestants. Among the signatures we find the names of those pioneers of Orangeism, James Verner, Stewart Blacker, and William Blacker, together with those of three Protestant clergymen who subsequently became bishops.[58]

On the 21st of February, 1796, the Protestant statesman, Mr. Grattan, said in the Irish House of Commons, that "the object of the *Orangemen* was the *extermination* of all the Catholics of that county [Armagh]. It was a persecution conceived in the bitterness of bigotry, carried on with the most ferocious barbarity, by a banditti who, being of the religion of the State, had committed with the greater audacity and confidence the most horrid murders, and had proceeded from robbery and murder to extermination. They had repealed, by their own authority, all the laws lately passed in favour of the Catholics, and established, in the place of these laws, the inquisition of a mob resembling Lord George Gordon's fanatics, equalling them in outrage, and surpassing them far in perseverance and success. Their modes of outrage were as numerous as they were atrocious. They sometimes forced, by terror, the masters of families to dismiss their Catholic servants; they sometimes

---

[56] This speech is given in full in the Third Parl. *Report* of 1835, also in Plowden's *Hist. Review*, Appendix, xcix. Lord Gosford was a Government man, but, says Plowden, "his honour and integrity were unassailable." Eight years after this address, he said he might have made it "much stronger." *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd. pp. 36, 37.

[57] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 431.

[58] When sending the resolutions to Secretary Pelham, Lord Gosford wrote: "Of late no night passes that houses are not destroyed, and scarce a week that some dreadful murders are not committed." As far back as October he had "found the country in a state of extreme disorder." See *note* 24 and text, *supra*.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

forced landlords, by terror, to dismiss their Catholic tenantry." He then describes the cruel treatment which the Catholic weavers had received at the hands of "those insurgents, who called themselves *Orange Boys*, or Protestant Boys—that is, a banditti of murderers, committing massacre in the name of God, and exercising despotic power in the name of liberty."[59]

"TO HELL OR CONNAUGHT!"

Grattan continues: "They [the Orange Boys] had *very generally* given the Catholics notice to quit their farms and dwellings, which notice was plastered on their houses,[60] and conceived in these short but plain words: 'Go to Hell—Connaught won't receive you—fire and faggot—Will Thresham and John Thrustout.' They followed those notices by a faithful and punctual execution of the horrid threat, and soon after visited the house, robbed the family, and destroyed what they did not take, and finally completed the atrocious persecution by forcing the unfortunate inhabitants to leave their land, their dwellings, and their trade, and to travel with their miserable family." He then refers to the murders committed by "that atrocious and rebellious banditti"; declares that "the Catholic inhabitants of Armagh have been actually put out of the protection of the law; the magistrates have been supine or partial; and the horrid banditti [the Orangemen] have met with complete success, and from the magistrates very little discouragement," in this horrid persecution, this abominable barbarity, and this general extermination."[61]

Proceeding, Mr. Grattan remarked: "It has been said by the mover of the resolution that, of the Defenders, multitudes have been hanged, multitudes have been put to death on the field, and that they are suppressed, though not extinguished; but with regard to the outrages of the Orange Boys no such boast could be made. On the contrary, they have met with

[59] They seized the weavers and sent them, as deserters, to serve in the fleet, unless they purchased their liberty by money or drink. The magistrates and Lord Carhampton—presuming on the connivance of the Government—sent multitudes on board the fleet on mere suspicion. An Act of Indemnity was passed, with retrospective effect, to secure the official lawbreakers against prosecution. See Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. xvi. p. 458.

[60] This was a felony, punishable by death, by Acts of the 15th and 16th George II. None of the Orangemen were prosecuted for this kind of intimidation.

[61] According to Grattan's speech, the resolutions of the Armagh magistrates were forced upon them by the shameful excesses of the Orangemen. Madden has collected a number of the rude and sometimes indecent notices affixed by the Orange "wreckers" to the houses of Catholics in Armagh. They will be found in his *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., Appendix vi., p. 337, Duffy's ed. 1846.

impunity, and success, and triumph. They have triumphed over the law; they have triumphed over the magistrates; they have triumphed over the people. Their persecution, inquisition, murder, robbery, devastation, and extermination have been entirely victorious." Grattan's account of the outrages of the original Orangemen is borne out by other members of the wholly Protestant Irish Parliament who spoke on the subject at this time, *e.g.*, by Maurice Fitzgerald, Knight of Kerry, by William Smith, M.P., and by the Attorney-General of the day.[62] In the course of the same debate (on the Insurrection Bill), Sir Laurence Parsons referred to the manner in which some of the Ulster magistrates "most cruelly persecuted the Catholics"; and Colonel (afterwards General) Craddock admitted that the conduct of the Orangemen in the county of Armagh was at that time atrocious, and that their barbarous practices should be put down.[63]

"The unanimous Address of the Sheriff, Governor, Grand Jury, and Magistracy" of Armagh to Lord Camden, at the Lent Assizes, 1796, also refers to "the outrages which, for some time past, have disturbed the peace and interrupted the prosperity of this prosperous county."[64]

Mr. James Christie, a member of the Society of Friends, was, perhaps, the most venerable and remarkable of the witnesses examined by the Select Committee (Irish) of 1835. He was twenty-four years old when the battle of the Diamond was fought, had resided on the borders of Armagh county since 1793, and was an eye-witness of what he describes.[65] The first disturbances he recollected occurred in the neighbourhood of Colonel Verner's residence. He gives a vividly grim description of what was comprised under the term "wrecking"—breaking open the doors, smashing everything that was capable of being broken; destroying webs, looms, furniture, and setting the house on fire. Twelve or fourteen houses were thus "wrecked" in his district in a single night. The poor Catholics left their houses in terror. Some of them slept at night in his father's plantations. Many murders were committed by the rioters, but, says Mr. Christie, "no investigation took place; the magistrates were supine and inactive." He personally saw three Catholic chapels burned

[62] Grattan's speech is given in Plowden's *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. ii., part i., pp. 547-549; also in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 46-48. Quotations from the speeches of the others named above are given in Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. xxxix., pp. 654-655.

[63] Plowden's *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 41, 42.

[64] This address is given in full by "M.P.," p. 42.

[65] See his evidence as to the Armagh outrages at Qq. 5566 *sqq.* of the *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report*.

down by the rioters,[66] but he never heard of "any Protestant or Presbyterian places of worship being burned or injured" in any part of the North of Ireland.[67] "My father," said he,[68] "received notices, which I saw—anonymous letters—commanding him to turn off his Catholic servants, and not to employ them in his work." The house-wrecking, he states, continued for "two or three years." When, "five or six years afterwards" (in 1800 or 1801), some of the exiled Catholics ventured to return again, they found that "the property which they [had] left was transferred, in most instances, to Protestants, even in cases where the former occupants had held life leases (Q. 5570).

"SWORD, FIRE, AND FAGGOT."

The Protestant Viceroy of Ireland, Lord Camden, describes the disturbance of the early Orangemen as "acts of the greatest outrage and barbarity against their Catholic neighbours."[69] The *Dublin Evening Post*, a Protestant newspaper, in its issue of September 24, 1796, gives a fearful picture of the "bloody excesses" committed even then—twelve months after the battle of the Diamond—by the Orangemen in Ulster: "Murder in all its horrid forms, assassinations in cold blood, the mutilation of members without respect to age or sex, the firing of whole hamlets, so that when the inhabitants have been looked after, nothing but their ashes were to be found; the atrocious excursions of furious hordes, armed with sword, fire, and faggot, to exterminate a people."[70] McNevin, in his *Pieces of Irish History*,[71] states that the Orange rioters frequently fired into the coffins of the dead at funerals, and otherwise interfered with the religious observances of their Catholic fellow-countrymen.

The Orange leader, Mr. Verner, in 1796, during the course of a debate in the Irish House of Commons, admitted that

---

[66] *Ibid.*, Q. 5587; see Q. 5585.

[67] *Ibid.*, Q., 5589.

[68] *Ibid.*, Q., 5596.

[69] Letter to Portland, January 22, 1796, quoted by Froude, *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 178. Froude admits that Camden refers to the Orangemen.

[70] Quoted by Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., ch. xxx., p. 238.

[71] P. 113. I have quoted mainly from contemporary Protestant testimony as to the outrages of the early Orangemen. The author of *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1797) might be added to the list. He enters into full details of many fearful outrages, and is extensively quoted by Madden (see chap. ii., *note* 68, p. 28). The two Catholic contemporary authorities, Plowden and McNevin, confirm the accounts given by the Protestant witnesses quoted above. *Historical Review*, vol. ii., pp. 539, *sqq.*; *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd.; *Pieces of Irish History*, pp. 113 *sqq.*

outrages had been committed by the Orangemen.[72] Lecky says that "the most conspicuous document" written at the time in the Orange interest draws a picture of the Reign of Terror which is "sufficiently dark." He adds that, nevertheless, the authority of its author (a Mr. Alexander) "cannot compete with that of Lord Gosford and the magistrates who assembled at Armagh; and the correspondence in the possession of the Government [some of which he quotes] appears to me to do little or nothing to attenuate the picture."[73]

There is one signal feature in this initial Reign of Terror of the lodges which, by itself alone, fully establishes the purely aggressive character of the early Orange institution. It is this: The Orange outrages thus described were not alone practised upon large bodies of people who were guiltless of any crime save the profession of the Catholic faith, but they were carried out for a period of over two years, throughout a large area of Ulster, against an unresisting population. McNevin distinctly states that after the battle of the Diamond the Catholic party in Armagh never raised their heads again.[74] And Lecky—whose testimony has been already quoted—admits that, after that encounter, "the rioters met with scarcely any resistance or disturbance."[75] But perhaps the most scandalous feature in the lawlessness of the lodges was the connivance of the magistracy and of the Government in their excesses, for party and political ends.[76]

THE ROLL CALL.

It is obviously impossible to estimate the number of Catholics that were killed, forced on board transports, sold, or sent "to Hell or Connaught" during the three feverish years of proscription and outrage with which the lodge era of Orange history was ushered in. We have already seen Lord Gosford's statement that as early as December 28, 1795, a great portion of the population of Armagh had been driven out of their homes. On the 26th of October, 1796, the illustrious orator, Curran (a Protestant), offered, in the Irish House of Commons, to produce sworn evidence that not less than 1,400 Catholic *families* had been barbarously expelled

[72] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 434; see also *Minutes* of Select Parl. Committee of 1835, *First Report*, p. 19.

[73] Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 434.

[74] *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 115.

[75] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 429.

[76] Further evidence of the partiality of the magistracy will be found in Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 432, *note*, 446, 449; also in Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 41, 42, 48; Walpole's *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. xv., p. 457; Bouverie-Pusey, *The Past History of Ireland*, p. 107. See also ch. xiv., *infra*. As to the Government, see Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 437, 438, 441, etc.

from their houses, or murdered, or burned in their cottages, or had died of fatigue or famine in the fields or highways; and that the same fearful scenes were still being enacted in open day, without any effectual interference.[77]

Rev. James Gordon, a Church of England clergyman and contemporary historian, whose sons were members of the fraternity, gives the number of Catholic families who were forcibly expelled *by the Orangemen* as "fourteen hundred, according to the most probable account."[78] This estimate is confirmed by two well-known Protestant eye-witnesses—Mr. Stuart, of Acton, and Rev. Mr. Stuart, of Armagh—who made out a list which brought the victims of the Orange Reign of Terror to over 7,000 persons.[79] This is likewise the estimate made by what Lecky terms the "evidently truthful *Memoir*," presented to the Government in 1798 by the United Irish leaders, Emmet, O'Connor, and McNevin.[80] The well-informed contemporary writer, "Observer," whose *View of the Present State of Ireland* appeared in 1797, states that *in Armagh county alone* seven hundred *families* "were driven to poverty and desolation, their houses burned, and their property destroyed by Orangemen."[81]

Lord Moira (a Protestant nobleman), in a letter to Secretary Pelham, October 19th, 1796, enclosed a list of ninety-one *of his own tenants* who had been expelled from their homes. "Most of them," he says, "have had their little property either destroyed or taken; many of them have been cruelly wounded." All this occurred in a very small district of "only four townlands," in a parish which "*in an inferior degree* has felt the effects of that licentious barbarity." He further states that "the persecution is even now [at the date of his letter] continuing with unabated activity."[82]

Lord Altamount's brother (November 5, 1796) gave an

---

[77] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxx., p. 239.

[78] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 348 (Dublin, 1806).

[79] Plowden, *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 50, *note*. According to Plowden, this list was delivered to Under-Secretary Cooke and ought to be found in Dublin Castle. "The person who delivered it to Mr. Cooke . . . assured the author that he knew the country so depopulated, which covered an extent of thirteen miles by eleven, had examined the list and had every reason to give full credit to its accuracy." *Ibid.*; cf. Molesworth's *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 376.

[80] *Memoir of the Union*, p. 14, also in McNevin's *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 186. Lecky's opinion of the *Memoir* is given in *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 140 (ed. 1871).

[81] Quoted in Madden's *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., p. 333, ed. 1846.

[82] Lord Moira to Pelham, Oct. 19, 1796, quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 439.

incomplete list of 950 of the fugitives who were on the Altamount estate alone, near Castlebar (county of Mayo).[83] Lord Altamount estimated that some 4,000 of these unhappy people had taken refuge from the barbarity of the Orangemen *in the one county of Mayo alone*, besides a number which he cannot take upon himself to compute in other parts of Connaught.[84] The *Dublin Evening Post* of August 27, 1796, states that "a single gentleman (Col. Martin, of the county of Galway) has given asylum to 1,000 souls on his own estate, all peaceable, inoffensive, and living by the labour of their hands."[85] Others took refuge in other parts of Ireland, some penetrating as far south as the county of Kerry.[86] In their new homes the unhappy fugitives struck the Protestant gentry and officials as being, in their bearing and conduct, loyal, peaceable, and industrious people.[87]

THE LONE RAY.

Almost the only bright spot in the dark surroundings of this woful period, was the kindness extended to the persecuted Catholics by the Presbyterians of Ulster, especially by those of the counties of Down and Antrim. Through the friendly help of the Presbyterians of Belfast, a large number of the fugitives were enabled to settle in Glasgow and Paisley, forming there the first Irish colony, which, in 1810, was computed to number nearly 20,000 people.[88] All things considered, it does not seem to the present writer that the estimate of 7,000 refugees is by any means excessive.

"It is no exaggeration to say," writes Lecky, "that the exiles may be numbered by thousands, and it is impossible to resist the conclusion that some of the magistrates shamefully tolerated or connived at the outrages. Nothing of this kind had occurred in Ireland since the days of Cromwell, and the consternation, the panic, the widely exaggerated rumours it produced, exercised an enormous influence on Irish politics."[89]

THE CHARTER TOAST.

Orangemen, and especially Irish Orangemen, have to this day

---

[83] Quoted by Lecky, *loc. cit.*, p. 441.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

[85] *Ibid.*, *note*.

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] *Op. cit.*, pp. 440, 444; cf. Lord Gosford's evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, Q. 3671.

[88] McNevin's *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 117; Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 67. We shall see, in chapter v. (*infra*) that the original Orangemen were exclusively, or almost exclusively, members of the Established Church, and that the Presbyterians, as a rule, held aloof from the society.

[89] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., pp. 445-446.

a warm corner in their hearts for Oliver Cromwell, who, after William of Orange, did most to impoverish, persecute, and degrade their Catholic fellow-countrymen.[90] Reference has been already made to the sympathy expressed by Giffard, the father of the Orange system, for the policy of banishment, proscription, and extermination pursued by Cromwell during and after his wars in Ireland. The reader has already seen how the early lodges adopted, and carried out as far as lay in their power, the Protector's policy of confiscating the property of Catholics, and sending its rightful owners to "Hell or Connaught."[91] In the Charter Toast, Cromwell's name occupies a place of honour second only to that of the chief tutelary deity of the association, William, Prince of Orange. This toast is a literary curiosity. It is given by Sir Jonah Barrington, who, writing in 1827, says that it existed before the foundation of Orangeism, but that it was "afterwards adopted by the Orange societies generally, and [is] still, I believe, considered as the Charter Toast of them all."[92] Sir Jonah had special opportunities for verifying his statements regarding this toast. He was the intimate friend of the noted Dr. Duigenan, and as early as March, 1798, was, with him, a member of Orange Lodge No. 176 (Dublin), according to the official evidence laid before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835.[93] What he terms the "Orange toast," was originally taken on the bare knees, and ran as follows:

"The glorious, pious, and immortal memory of the great and good King William—not forgetting Oliver Cromwell, who assisted in redeeming us from Popery, slavery, arbitrary power, brass money, and wooden shoes.[94] May we never want a Williamite to kick the . . of a Jacobite![95] and a . . for

[90] Orange lodges are frequently named after Cromwell. For instance, a lodge in Echuca (Victoria) bears the title "Cromwell's Ironsides."

[91] Under the Protectorate, Irish Catholics were deprived of several million acres of land which had escaped the confiscations of previous reigns, and a great part of them were banished to the poorest province, Connaught. By a rigorous passport system, they were forbidden, under pain of death without trial, to approach within two miles of the Shannon or four miles of the sea. Great numbers were massacred, as at Drogheda, Wexford, etc., and thousands were sold as slaves to American and West Indian planters. The exercise of the Catholic religion was forbidden almost as completely as it was later on during the *régime* of William of Orange. See Prendergast's *Cromwellian Settlement*, pp. 89 *sqq.*, 96-185.

[92] *Personal Sketches and Recollections of his Own Times*, first published in 1827 (Cameron and Ferguson's ed. of 1883, pp. 131-132).

[93] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 9522.

[94] "The brass money refers to James's finance, and the wooden shoes to his French allies." *Encycl. Brittannica*, 9th ed., art. "Orangemen."

[95] This part of the Charter Toast finds curious confirmation in Lecky's *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (vol. i., ch. ii., pp. 321-322), in his description of Dublin city in that century. Lecky says: "A bust of the same

the *Bishop of Cork*.[96] And he that won't drink this, whether he be priest, bishop, deacon, bellows-blower, grave-digger, or other of the fraternity of the *clergy*, may a north wind blow him to the south, and a west wind to the east! May he have a dark night, a lee shore, a rank storm, and a leaky vessel to carry him over the River Styx! May the dog Cerberus make a meal of his r——p, and Pluto a snuff-box of his skull; may the devil jump down his throat with a red-hot harrow, with every pin tear out a gut, and blow him with a *clean* carcass to hell! Amen!"

Several writers[97] assert that some Orangemen rounded off the conclusion of the Williamite sentiment in the following fashion: "May he be rammed, crammed, and jammed into the great gun of Athlone, and blown on to the hob of hell, where he'll be kept roasting for all eternity, the devil basting him with melted bishops, and his imps pelting him with priests."

The facts of the Orange Charter Toast are, that it consisted of (*a*) invariable, (*b*) slightly variable, and (*c*) very variable, elements. (*a*) The first thirteen words given by Sir Jonah Barrington have undergone no alteration, and are retained by the lodges to this day. (*b*) The next following nineteen words of the first sentence (as quoted above) have been subjected to slight modifications. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* gives the following as the "commonest form" of the Orange toast: (*a*) "The glorious, pious, and immortal memory of the great and good King William, (*b*) who saved us from Popery, slavery, knavery, brass money, and wooden shoes." (*c*) The authority just quoted states that the Toast concluded "with grotesque or truculent additions according to the orator's taste." Mr. Charles Phillips, a distinguished Protestant barrister, quotes the following "loyal toast" as "handed down by Orange tradition" at Derry. In a footnote to his *Speeches*, Phillips gives the following toast, and evidently refers to it as the one proposed by the Derry Recorder, Sir

Sovereign [William III., Prince of Orange] *bearing an insulting distich* reflecting on the adherents of James, was annually painted by the [Dublin] Corporation. The toast of the 'glorious, pious and immortal memory' was given on all public occasions by the Viceroy." This—which took place long before the foundation of the Orange Society—confirms in so far the statement of Barrington. The "insulting distich" is given by Lecky in a footnote (i., 322):

"May we never want a Williamite
To kick the breech of a Jacobite!"

[96] In allusion to Bishop Peter Browne of Cork "who in 1715 wrote cogently against the practice of toasting the dead." *Encyclo. Britannica*, 9th ed., art. "Orangemen."

[97] See, for instance, "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, pp. 28-29.

George Hill, early in the present century, at a public dinner which was given to celebrate the return of one of the Ponsonbys to Parliament:

(*a*) "The glorious, pious, and immortal memory of the great and good King William, (*b*) who saved us from Pope and Popery, James and slavery, brass money and wooden shoes; (*c*) *here is bad luck to the Pope, and a hempen rope to all Papists*——."[98]

Here I end the story of the rise and early progress of the Orange society. It is no pleasant tale to unfold. None the less, it must needs be told if the reader is to grasp the spirit out of which the association grew, and the principles which guided its budding activities. In the records of its stormy youth we seek in vain for any indication that the society was a purely defensive one, or that its chief purpose was the maintenance of the open Bible, the Protestant religion, the laws of the land, and the cultivation of virtue—the principles on which, we are assured, the foundations of the Orange institution are laid. The following chapters—which treat of the society's relations with its members, with the Protestant Churches, the Catholic body, and the civil authorities—will bring out in still clearer light the broad lines of a policy which it has steadily pursued ever since the wild times when the deeds of the "atrocious banditti" of the North brought back to the Irish mind the memory of the days of Cromwell.

---

[98] *The Speeches of Charles Phillips*, p. 121, published in 1817 by Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Browne, London. Phillips gives this toast in a footnote, and evidently leaves it to be inferred that it was the one, the public proposal of which led indirectly to the case of O'Mullan *v.* McKorkill, in which he was engaged, and which excited considerable public interest at the time. Phillip's *Speeches*, pp. 120 *sqq*.

The following are said to have been favourite Orange toasts: "The Pope in the pillory, the pillory in hell, and the devil pelting him with priests." "May the ears of all the Papists be nailed to the chapel, and the chapel transplanted into hell." During the debate on Drummond's Constabulary Bill, instances were alleged in the House of Commons of these toasts having been given by Orange policemen. Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*, p. 219.

Chapter V.

MEMBERSHIP: ITS LIMITATIONS—"NO PAPIST NEED APPLY"—THE QUEEN, THE RITUALISTS, AND OTHER "WISHY-WASHY," "SHILLY-SHALLY," "NAMBY-PAMBY" PROTESTANTS—A MARRIAGE-LAW OF THE LODGES—WHO ARE ELIGIBLE?

THERE are three features in connection with the membership of the Orange institution which call for more than passing notice.

I. Admission to membership is open to Protestants only. "No Papist need apply."

II. The Protestants that are eligible for membership are only those of "the right kind"—that is, those who are prepared to adopt an aggressive attitude towards the Catholic Church, its principles, its members, and its institutions.

III. These are admitted only under terms which place their membership and their political action at the beck and call of the Grand Lodge, or of the autocrat of the lodges—the Grand Master.

I. PROTESTANTS ONLY.

The Orange society is, and has ever been, exclusively Protestant in its membership. *The Early Ordinances of the Armagh Orangemen*, published in 1801 by King, Westmoreland Street, Dublin, have the following: "3rd. That our association being an exclusively Protestant association, meant for Protestant purposes, all Papists are not only to be excluded from our community, but we pledge ourselves that we will not sell to such or buy from such; neither will we drink with them, talk with them, or walk with them, but we will treat them as *enemies to our religion, and traitors* to the good Protestant King who holds the succession of the throne in the noble House of Hanover." The purely Protestant character of the Orange institution, if not the same spirit of exclusive dealing, was steadfastly maintained throughout the frequent alterations which were forced upon it by external influences in 1799, 1814, 1821, 1825, 1828, 1834, 1845, 1849, 1869, 1872, and on to the present hour. In the "General Declaration" of the *Rules*

and Regulations of 1800,[1] the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland says: "We further declare that we are *exclusively* a Protestant association; yet, detesting as we do any intolerant spirit, we solemnly pledge ourselves to each other, that we will not persecute, injure, or upbraid any person on account of his religious opinions, *provided the same be not hostile to the State.*" This saving clause was retained in the Irish revised rules of 1814. Mr. Swan, Deputy Grand Secretary of the society, was questioned by the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 as to whether he considered the Roman Catholic religion "hostile to the State." He frankly replied: "I do."[2]

By the rules of 1800, every Orangeman, on his initiation, was required to take a lengthy oath, of which the following was a part: "I, A.B., do solemnly and sincerely swear, of my own free will and accord . . . that I am not, nor ever was, a Roman Catholic or Papist."[3]

By the same rules, the Master, Deputy Master, Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Treasurer, and the five Committee-men were furthermore required to take, upon their appointment, a special "obligation," in which, among other things, they severally swear

---

[1] *Rules and Regulations for the use of all Orange Societies: revised and corrected by a Committee of the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland, and adopted by the Grand Orange Lodge, Jan. 10, 1800.* They are given in full in Plowden's *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., after Introduction, and in Appendix to *Report* of Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges.

[2] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 1207.

[3] The full oath ran as follows: "I, A.B., do solemnly and sincerely swear, of my own free will and accord, that I will, to the utmost of my power, support and defend the present King George the Third, his heirs and successors, *so long* as *he and they support the Protestant ascendency*, the Constitution and laws of these kingdoms, and that I will ever hold sacred the name of our glorious deliverer, William the Third, Prince of Orange; and I do further swear that I am not, nor ever was, a Roman Catholic or Papist; that I was not, am not, nor ever will be, a United Irishman; and that I never took the oath of secrecy to that or any other treasonable society; and I do further swear, *in the presence of Almighty God*, that I will always conceal and never will reveal either part or parts of what is now to be privately communicated to me, until I shall be authorised so to do by the proper authorities of the Orange institution; that I will neither write it, nor indite it, stamp, stain, or engrave it, nor cause it so to be done, on paper, parchment, leaf, bark, stick, stone, or anything, so that it may be known; and I do further swear that I have not, to my knowledge or belief, been proposed and rejected in or expelled from any other Orange lodge, and that I now become an Orangeman without fear, bribery, or corruption. So help me God." Appendix to *Report* of Select Committee, p. 3.

The English Parliamentary Committee's *Report* says that it was "distinctly proved to the Committee that every member admitted prior to 1821" took this particular oath, which, with the other Rules of 1800, was placed in evidence. The reader will note the oath of conditional loyalty therein. Cf. Appendix B, *infra*.

"that I was not, nor am not [*sic*], a Roman Catholic or Papist." In addition to this, the Master and Deputy Master swear "that I will not knowingly admit, or consent any person for me shall admit, anyone into the society of Orangemen who was, or is, a Papist." Each of the five Committee-men takes a similar oath: "That whenever I may be called upon to act in the absence of the Master or Deputy Master, I will not knowingly admit anyone into the society of Orangemen who was, or is, a Papist." The ninth of the Secret Articles of 1800 runs briefly thus: "No Roman Catholic can be admitted *on any account*." The same rule holds good to the present day.

This exclusiveness is kept up in the Rules and Constitutions adopted by the Grand Lodge of Victoria in 1878 and 1893.[4] In all the Orange codes it is part of the "basis of the institution" that it should be "composed of *Protestants* resolved to support and defend, to the utmost of their power, the *Protestant religion*." By rules 2 and 59 of Victoria (ed. 1893) Catholics are as rigidly excluded as ever from membership. By the *Ritual of Introduction to the Orange Degree*, every candidate for membership is required to this day to kneel down before the assembled brethren, and, holding the Bible in his hands, to make what purports to be a solemn declaration, but which, as we shall see in the next chapter, is in effect either a true oath, or at least (as the English Parliamentary Select Committee declare) the equivalent of an oath. Part of this declaration (which is given in full in Appendix B) runs as follows:

"I do solemnly and sincerely declare that . . . I am not, nor ever was, and never will be, a Roman Catholic, and that I am not married to one, nor will I marry one, or willingly permit any child of mine to marry one."

This abiding dread of Catholics, or of persons suspected of being well disposed to Catholics, gaining admission to membership to the Orange institution, finds amusing expression in the proceedings of the Irish Grand Lodge for May 28 and 29, 1859, as published in the *Report* of the Royal Commission on the Belfast riots of 1857.[5] The Limerick Orange lodge (No. 1080)

[4] *The Laws and Constitution of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria, as passed at a Special Grand Lodge Meeting held at the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, on the 3rd April, 1878, and confirmed at a Grand Lodge Meeting held at Geelong on the 7th June, 1878, and Resolutions passed by the Grand Lodge.* Daylesford: Cross and Co., Machine Printers, Albert Street East, 1885 (20 pages)—*The Laws and Constitution of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria, as adopted at the Annual Grand Lodge Meeting, held at the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, Wednesday, 8th November, 1893.* Melbourne: Bro. C. W. Burford, Printer, 548 Flinders Street, Melbourne, 1893.—Both these books of Rules are in the possession of the writer of these pages. Those of 1893, which are now (1897) current in the lodges, are given in Appendix C.

[5] Appendix 14, p. 284.

made application to have one Patrick Flanagan admitted to membership. There was apparently nothing against Patrick except the rank odour of Popery which arose from his name. The Grand Lodge, however, declared that, for motives of "prudence," they could not "meet the wishes" of the brethren in the city of the violated treaty.

WHAT PROTESTANTS?

What do Orangemen mean by the somewhat vague term, "the" Protestant religion? Originally they meant the Established Church of England, and that alone. In 1795, when Orangeism originated in Armagh, the term "Protestant" was used to designate exclusively the established "Protestant religion."[6] The members of the other non-Catholic denominations were not termed "Protestants," but "Presbyterians," etc., and, generically, "Dissenters." This will be made abundantly evident by reading the works of contemporary writers, and, for a still later period, the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges.[7] Even at the present day the word "Protestant" is still habitually used in every part of Ireland, but especially in the North, to distinguish Anglicans from Presbyterians, Methodists, etc. The reader who has had no experience of Irish life is referred to answers given regarding their religion by some of the witnesses examined by the Royal Commissions on the Belfast riots of 1857 and 1886.

The second rule of the Boyne society—one of the earliest of the Orange associations—says: "We are exclusively a Protestant association." In a subsequent rule (No. 9) they

---

[6]Killen, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 363, *note* 3.

[7]For instance, the Select Committee ask Mr. Christie (Q. 5589): "Were any *Protestant or Presbyterian* places of worship burned or injured?" Plowden and other writers of his day habitually use the word "Protestant" to designate the Church of England, and the words "Protestant religion" were long understood to mean the same Church exclusively. One of the witnesses called by the Royal Commission of 1857 said he was not a Protestant but a Presbyterian. One of the early rules of the Orange society is said to have run as follows: "3. Resolved, that no member is to introduce a Papist or Presbyterian, Quaker or Methodist, *or any persuasion but a Protestant*." This was published in the closing years of the last century. Musgrave denies its authenticity; Plowden affirms it (Introd., pp. 87, 88); Killen inclines to believe it (ii., 363). At any rate, it was largely acted upon. Authentic or not, it will serve equally well to illustrate the point in question. Cf. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, iii., 448. Mr. J. Coleman, M.R.S.A.I., tells of an Irishman who was a member of a public body in England, and who "created considerable merriment by stoutly denying that Dissenters were Protestants." London *Tablet*, December 26, 1896. See chap. iv., *supra*; see also Madden, *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. iii., p. 318, where Emmet addresses himself to Protestants, Presbyterians, and Catholics.

explain the meaning they attach to the word "Protestant," when they refer to King William, Prince of Orange, "who bravely supported our rights, and *established* the Protestant religion."[8] By the declarations of the Loyal Boyne and Orange Association, passed at Lisbellaw, June 4th, 1797, the members pledge themselves to "maintain the true Protestant religion and ascendency, as *established and declared* at the glorious Revolution of 1688."[9] In their declaration of February 19, 1798, the Orangemen of Ulster proclaim their steady attachment "to our valuable constitution *in Church and State*."[10] And the society's amended and unconstitutional oath of 1800 pledged the members to allegiance to the King and his heirs only "so long as he and they support *the Protestant* ascendency." The rules of 1800 have the following under the heading of "General Declaration":[11]

"We also associate in honour of King William the Third, Prince of Orange, whose name we bear, as supporters of his glorious memory and *the true Religion by him completely established* in these kingdoms."

The meaning of the phrase, "Protestant ascendency," was clearly explained in 1792 in an address of the Protestant Lord Mayor, sheriffs, commons, and citizens of Dublin to the Protestants of Ireland. In the course of this document they declare that the words mean a Protestant Crown and Parliament, a Protestant *hierarchy*, and Protestants in every position of honour and emolument under the State.[12]

"The early Orangemen," says the Presbyterian historian, Killen, "were professedly organised in support of the existing Protestant ascendency *in Church and State*, so that no Presbyterian who respected himself and the principles of the religious community with which he was connected could join the association. It was asserted by persons living at the time, who were furnished with the best means of obtaining information, that those who constituted their earliest lodges were all Episcopalians."[13] The Orange historian, Musgrave, bears out this statement.[14] The Anglican clergyman, Rev. Mortimer

---

[8] Musgrave's *Strictures* on Plowden's *Hist. Review*, p. 228.

[9] *Annals and Defence of the Loyal Orange Institution*, by O. R. Gowan, late Grand Secretary. Dublin, 1825, quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 30.

[10] Quoted by Musgrave, the Orange writer, in his *Strictures* on Plowden, p. 227.

[11] See *note* 1, *supra*.

[12] Musgrave, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, Appendix, p. 12. The reader will find the words quoted textually in chapter xii., *infra*.

[13] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 363, 364.

[14] *Strictures*, p. 148; *Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 74. Cf. *note* 21, ch. iv., *supra*.

O'Sullivan, Deputy Grand Chaplain of the society, says in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges: "I believe the first Orange lodge consisted *exclusively* of members of the Church of England."[15] Mr. Verner, an Orange M.P., in his speech before the Irish House of Commons, 7th November, 1796, says: "That body of men called Orange Boys, to whom so many wanton and unprovoked cruelties had been attributed, were Protestants of the Established Church."[16] And Lord Gosford says in his evidence before the Committee of 1835: "I think that the *original* institution of Orangemen was confined to the Church of England."[17] Mr. Alexander, an Armagh Protestant magistrate, writing to the Government in November, 1796, said: "The Orangemen are almost entirely composed of members of the Established Church."[18] Grattan, in his speech in the Irish House of Commons, February 21st, 1796 (quoted in chapter iv.), stated that the Orange "banditti" of the time were "of the religion of the State." Plowden, writing in 1810, describes the Orangemen of his day as "a very small portion of the population, *professing the religion of the State*."[19] The county of Armagh, where Orangeism originated, was "a species of English colony"—the most Episcopalian county in Ireland—and the Peep-o'-Day Boy movement there was, at least to a very great extent, before the battle of the Diamond, carried on by the (nominal) adherents of the favoured creed.[20] A large portion of the members of the Ulster lodges to this day consist of the lower orders of the Episcopalian Church,[21] which, *per contra*, has given to the Irish nation—with the exception of O'Connell—all the great leaders she has chosen to voice her aspirations during more than a hundred years of her history.

The English Select Committee of the House of Commons on Orange lodges say in the *Report*, which they presented to Parliament (p. xvi.):

"Your Committee have to observe that the clergymen of the Church of England appear to have engaged, to a considerable extent, in the affairs of the Orange institution. The Right Reverend Thomas, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, is Lord Prelate and Grand Chaplain of the order. There are also twelve or thirteen Deputy Grand Chaplains of the institution. Some

[15] *First Report, Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 584.
[16] Quoted by Froude, *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 169.
[17] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 3656.
[18] Quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 433.
[19] *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 82, 83.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 9. Cf. chapter iv., *note* 21, *supra*.
[21] T. P. O'Connor, *The Parnell Movement*, ch. xii., p. 261 (popular ed 1887).

clergymen have warrants as Masters of lodges, and conduct their affairs. *No dissenting clergyman in England*, and only two clergymen of any persuasion in Scotland, appear to have joined the institution. The reverend functionaries of the institution are directed to appear in the Grand Lodge in canonicals; their insignia consist of a purple velvet scarf, with gold binding, gold fringe at the ends, and lined with orange silk."

THE PRESBYTERIANS.

Considering that one of the chief avowed objects of the Orange society was to perpetuate the political ascendency of the members of the established creed, at the expense of the remainder of the population of the country, it is not a matter of surprise that the Presbyterians (who formed the great bulk of the Protestant Dissenters in the North) should, as a body, long hold aloof from membership of the association. The authoritative statements of the many witnesses quoted above quite preclude the idea that any considerable number of them could have joined the early Orange society. Their earliness in the field of religious toleration in Ulster, the friendly feeling that had long subsisted between them and the Catholic body, their practical sympathy for the sufferings of the helpless victims of the "lawless banditti"—all go to prove the truth of Plowden's words, that "the Presbyterians generally abhorred the principles of the Orangemen."[22] At a subsequent period—when the first wild phase of the Ulster Reign of Terror had passed by—many Presbyterians joined the fraternity. Plowden says they were "chiefly of the lower orders."[23] Killen asserts that they were "not very warmly attached to their Church," persons "of little weight and intelligence," etc.[24] However this may be, the fact remains that the Presbyterians, as a body, have never been in sympathy with the Orange movement in Ireland, and, as far as I can find, the members of their communion who joined the fraternity have never been permitted to sit within the mystic portals of the Grand Lodge. The Rev. W. McClure and Rev. Richard Smith, D.D.—two Presbyterian clergymen of Derry, whose names are hallowed by many sacred memories—refused to give their meeting-house for the demonstrations of the Apprentice Boys. The clergy and committee of the first Presbyterian Church in Derry also declined to

[22] *Hist. of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., p. 66. He is combating Musgrave's exaggeration of the number of the Presbyterian yeomanry at a later date.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 363, 364; cf. pp. 367, 368, 464. Cf. chap. iv., *supra*.

permit the Orange brethren to use it for the typical celebration of their anniversary, on the twelfth of July, 1896.[25] Ulster Presbyterians will remember how, in many cases, as Rev. Mr. Armour, in one of his speeches before the General Assembly in Belfast, reminded them that they had been required to pay for leave to bury their dead in the sepulchres of their fathers. The *Burials Bill (Ireland)*, which was intended to remedy this old-standing grievance, was introduced into the House of Commons by the Catholic representative of Limerick. It had the warm support of every Irish Catholic member of the House. The Duke of Abercorn, whom Orangemen regard as a warm sympathiser, always cast his vote against the Bill, when he was a member of the House of Commons.[26] Lord Claude Hamilton, whose sympathies with Orangeism were most pronounced, when member of Parliament for Tyrone county, publicly advocated the burial of Presbyterians at low water mark.

In England, the Dissenters were strictly excluded from membership of the Orange lodges.[27] The English Orangemen were strongly opposed to the admission of members of other Protestant Churches to political rights and privileges. In a Grand Committee meeting held in April, 1832, Brother Eedes hotly condemns the "repeal of the Corporation and the Test Act" (1828) as "an act of political dislocation, tending to political dissolution." The Imperial Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland, was in the chair, and the sentiment seems to have met with the concurrence of all those "champions of civil and religious liberty" who were present.[28]

"A COMMON PLATFORM."

Times have changed. The Orange society, that railed against the extension of equal civil rights to Dissenters, now takes them to its bosom. The wolf and the lamb lie down together at last, in the face of the common foe—the Scarlet Woman of Babylon. In the Australian colonies a broad spirit of toleration and of friendly feeling towards Catholics exists among the better class of Protestants. The Anglican and the Presbyterian Churches are largely disassociated from

---

[25] The *Derry Journal*, July 3, 1896; also Dublin *Freeman's Journal* of previous days.

[26] See Dr. Kinnear's speech at Carndonagh, reported in *Derry Standard*, April, 1880.

[27] *Pict. Hist. of England*, vol. vii., p. 488; Miss Martineau's *Thirty Years Peace*, vol. ii., p. 274.

[28] Appendix to *Report* of English Select Parliamentary Committee on Orange lodges.

the Orange movement here.[29] It has, none the less, proved its capacity, in these colonies, for producing acute forms of local irritation. The membership rolls of the lodges are carefully guarded from profane eyes; but from all I have been able to discover, the Orange institution of Victoria (and, presumably, of the other colonies as well) is a thing of shreds and patches, a Joseph's coat of many colours, mainly composed of the adherents of the minor Protestant Churches. Primitive Methodist clergymen take a leading part in Orange demonstrations. One of their number has long been Grand Chaplain of the institution in Victoria. Another is its recognised press champion. Since the beginning of 1897, the Orange institution of Victoria has been coquetting with officers of the Salvation Army, and has made the conquest of several of its "captains."[30] All that is now needed in these colonies is a profession, real or nominal, of some or any of the many "persuasions" that are comprised under the generic term "Protestant," and the requisite degree of pious fury against the Catholic body, their doctrines, practices, and institutions. A tract that circulates extensively among the lodges of Victoria says: "We embrace all sections of the Protestant Church. Orangeism is a COMMON PLATFORM, on which all Protestants can meet without danger of collision on account of minor difficulties."[31] That "common

---

[29] Members of the Melbourne Caledonian Society and the Thistle Club may be interested in the following attempt made to draw them within the mystic circle of the L.O.L. The following is a true copy (punctuation included) of a lithographed circular now in the writer's possession:

Melbourne July 12th, 1895

Dear Sir, As the Pope and his followers are doing everything possible to neutralize the effects of the Reformation, a number of citizens of Scottish birth or descent think it is time that we should rouse up the spirit which prompted the old Covenanters, our fore-fathers to lay down their lives for the cause of freedom. We have therefore decided to call a meeting of those in sympathy with this movement and who are Scots, or of Scots descent at the Protestant Hall Exhibition Street (Upper Lodge Room) on Friday 16th day of August 1895 at 8 p.m. for the purpose of forming a Scottish Orange Lodge, to be called the "Black Watch," suggested colours:—42nd Tartan—motto "Scotland for ever" with the "Caledonian Society" and the "Thistle Club" as recruiting grounds. I may inform you that about 50 names have been sent in, including the Pipers who are anxious to form a Pipe Band. Yours fraternally

"Gang Warily."

The "Black Watch" lodge is numbered 163.

[30] *Victorian Standard*, February 27, 1897; April 30, 1897. The members of the Walhalla lodge (Victoria) attended, in full regalia, a Salvation Army service conducted by one "Captain" Glithroe, who had joined their ranks. *Victorian Standard*, June 30, 1897.

[31] *Twenty Reasons for being an Orangeman.*

platform" is set forth in the "General Qualifications" of an Orangeman, namely:

Strenuous opposition to the Roman Church;

Discountenance of its worship;

Resistance to the "extension of its power."

In one word, the "common platform" which Orangeism offers to all "Protestants" is simply this—an aggressive attitude towards Catholicism and Catholics.[32] This will appear more fully when we further consider the limits of membership in this chapter, and the action of the Orange body in succeeding ones. The Orange institution in the Australian colonies reminds one of the cages of "happy families" that one sees about Paternoster Row, where the cat, the mouse, the hawk, and the canary, live together in domestic bliss. To one Orangeman Christ may be the Living God; to his Unitarian or Socinian "brother," He may be a mere man, of, perhaps, not much account. To one Orangeman the Bible may be inspired in whole; to another only in part; to a third not at all. To some, the Sacraments may be means of grace, to others, mere empty mummeries. The Christian ministry may be to some a priesthood; to others a mere set of lay delegates; to others still, eternal punishments and eternal rewards, and the existence of a personal God or a personal Devil, may be alike myths. It matters not. All these things are, apparently, classed as "minor difficulties." There are, nevertheless, two articles of faith which no true Orangeman will venture to doubt: (*a*) that the Pope is the Man of Sin; and (*b*) that the Church of Rome is the Scarlet Woman of *Revelations*.[33] Here, at least, we have order amidst chaos; light in darkness. Here we have a bond of union that clamps together a thousand lines of cleavage. In this brief creed is summed up the whole Law and the Prophets.

No Papists need apply.

THE WRONG SORT.

Membership of the Orange institution is thus restricted severely to such as can style themselves "Protestants." But it would be a great mistake to suppose that a profession of faith in, say, the Thirty-nine Articles, or in the Westminster Confession, is sufficient—that any Protestant of the requisite age (over 18), and of known good character, has merely to apply for membership, and be admitted as a matter of course.

---

[32] The methods of arousing, expressing, and perpetuating this hatred of persons and things Catholic will be dealt with in chapters viii., and following.

[33] See chapter viii., *infra*.

As a matter of fact Orangemen entertain towards large classes of Protestants feelings of undisguised animosity. This hostility has its origin remotely in two cardinal principles of the association:

(*a*) Orangeism is the only *genuine* form of Protestantism;

(*b*) "He who is not with us is against us."[34]

"Orangeism is *identical* with Christianity," said Rev. Brother Madgwick at Sydney.[35] Another reverend orator declared at the Ararat (Victoria) demonstration in 1892, that "Orangeism is synonymous with Protestantism."[36] In a tract issued to the lodges,[37] Orangeism is defined as "Protestantism pure and simple, but thoroughly in earnest"; and again (in italics) as "*the essence and embodiment of British Protestantism.*" Similar expressions abound in the literature of the lodges. Any Protestant, therefore, or any form of Protestantism, that is not in harmony with the Orange society in its general policy of guerilla warfare against the Catholic body, would be dealt with in accordance with the motto of the lodges: "He who is not with us is against us." As a matter of fact:

(1) A large body of Protestants are deemed as ineligible for membership as if they were Papists. They are variously termed on the Orange platform "the wrong sort," the "shilly-shallies," the "wishy-washies," and the "namby-pambies."[38]

2. The eligible ones—"the right sort"—are initiated only on terms which place their membership and their political action at the beck and call of the autocrat of the lodges, the Grand Master.

1. Four classes of Protestants are excluded from membership of the Orange lodges, namely:

(*a*) Ritualists;

(*b*) Protestants who have at any time been Catholics;

(*c*) Protestants who have married Catholics;

(*d*) Liberal-minded Protestants.

The purpose of these rules is sufficiently evident. It is to debar from the society all persons who are open even to *suspicion* of entertaining friendly feelings towards Catholics. This system of exclusion practically makes membership of the Orange institution possible only to the most bigoted section of the community.

---

[34] In the *Ritual* of the Orange degree this is expressly laid down as the motto of the Orange association. See Appendix B.

[35] *Victorian Standard*, August 3, 1885.

[36] *Ararat Advertiser*, July, 1892.

[37] *Definition of Orangeism.*

[38] The epithets quoted above are taken from reports of Orange demonstrations published in the *Victorian Standard.*

RITUALISTS.

(*a*) *Ritualists.*—An Orange tract already referred to[39] declares that part of the "religious basis" of the society is to offer "a firm and Christian resistance to the encroachments of Scepticism, *Ritualism*, and Romanism." The fervour of the brethren's hatred of the Ritualistic body is only surpassed by their glowing antipathy to Catholics. On the 12th of July, 1891, the "Grand Master, Loyal Orange institution of England," issued an address to the fraternity under his jurisdiction. In the course of this manifesto (the full text of which is given in the *Belfast Weekly News*), he says: "In religion, let the true principles of the Reformation be your guide, *avoiding as a curse all semblance to Ritualism*, the unmistakeable stepping-stone to Popery." Ritualism is described by the *Victorian Standard* as "bastard Popery," and "Romanism in disguise." Rev. J. Cowperthwaite, at the Richmond (Melbourne) demonstration, 1893, referred contemptuously to the Ritualists as "half Protestants, half Romanists."[40] At the Maryborough (Victoria) demonstration in the previous year, Rev. Mr. Mathieson (Wesleyan) referred sorrowfully to the "Romanising" tendency of the Church of England.[41] According to the same paper,[42] Rev. Mr. Hart, at another Orange meeting in the same town, denounced the "lot of rubbish" that there was in the Episcopalian Church. Ritualism was also strongly condemned by Rev. T. Shanks and Rev. J. Caton at Orange meetings in Portland and Melbourne.[43] Additional evidence of the hostility of Orangemen towards Ritualists is given by "Ulsterman's" *Rise and Progress of Orangeism* (p. 87), published at the *Victorian Standard* office in 1895, "with the sanction and approval of the R.W.G.M., Bro. Hon. Simon Fraser, M.L.C.," to whom it is likewise dedicated. The Orange author of this literary curiosity writes: "It is certainly painful to all true Protestants (more especially to Orangemen) to hear of the spread of Ritualism amongst a section of the Anglican Church at the present time, particularly in Protestant England. The clerical lights (or, as we might very appropriately call them, candle-bearers) of such Churches might blush for shame when they look over the records of some of the early Protestant defenders. . . . It is not beyond the range of probability to state that, were it not for the combined union of the Orange institution, the very foundation of Protestant freedom, though so ably protected by

[39] *Definition of Orangeism.*
[40] *Victorian Standard*, July, 1893, p. 8.
[41] *Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser*, July 15, 1892.
[42] *Ibid.*, July 13, 1883.
[43] *Victorian Standard*, July 31 and August 31, 1896.

the British flag, would once again be undermined, and that too by the assistance of many professing Protestants of the Ritualistic class."[44] In the files of the Orange organ, the *Victorian Standard*, our Ritualistic friends are described in letters and in fiery articles, original and copied, as renegades to the religion of the Reformation, traitors to the Protestant cause, Papists and Jesuits in disguise, trucklers to Rome, etc.

Ritualists are not unreasonably suspected of entertaining friendly feelings towards Catholicism.

No Ritualists need apply.

EX-CATHOLICS.

(*b*) *Protestants who have at any time been Catholics.*—To this day every Orangeman, at his initiation, has to kneel down, and, holding the Bible in his hands, to take an oath, or a solemn protestation that is equivalent to an oath: "That I am not, nor ever was, and never will be, a Roman Catholic."[45] The following, which is a universal rule of the Orange society, appears in the laws, etc., of the Victorian institution of 1878, 1885, and 1893:

"2. No person who has *at any time* been a Roman Catholic, or has married one, shall he admitted into the institution except by the vote of the Grand Lodge (one vote in seven to exclude), founded upon testimonials of good character and a certificate of his having been duly elected by ballot (pursuant to Rule 1) in the lodge in which he is proposed; such certificate to be sent to the Grand Secretary. Any member marrying a Roman Catholic shall be expelled."

The saving clause in the first part of the rule quoted above ("the vote of the Grand Lodge") permits the privilege of membership to ex-Catholics of the type of the professional slanderers who from time to time have visited our shores. Their attacks on the Catholic body are, apparently, sufficient "testimonials of good character." I need only refer to the eager haste with which Grand Lodges took up this class of adventurers, and helped to swell the financial success of their tours by furnishing audiences and special "funds,"[46] undeterred by the repeated exposures, and the not infrequent and successful criminal prosecutions which have followed the career of many of these unhappy men and women in England, Scotland, and the United States.[47] One of the coarsest of

---

[44] *Rise and Progress of Orangeism*, p. 87. See chap. i., *supra*, *note* 24, p. 14.

[45] See *Ritual* of Orange degree, Appendix B.

[46] *Victorian Standard*, 2nd June, 1885.

[47] The business of slandering Catholic institutions has, under the auspices of Exeter Hall, the Orange society, and of the A.P.A. in America,

these calumniators was made a member of the institution in Australia. His pamphlets (containing reports of his lectures) circulate freely to this day in the lodges of Victoria, and have been offered as premiums to Orangemen who procure fresh subscribers for the *Victorian Standard*. The nature of one of them may be inferred from the fact that it has been repeatedly offered for sale in the advertising columns of a certain daily paper among a list of books which many people deem unfit reading for any respectable household. The "Escaped Nun," Mrs. O'Gorman Auffray, on account of her sex, was not admissable to membership of the Orange society, but "the services which the lady has rendered to the cause of Protestantism wherever she has lectured" were duly appreciated by the Victorian Grand Lodge. At a meeting of the Grand Committee (29th Sept., 1886) it was resolved that: "In order to have Mrs. O'Gorman Auffray's lectures fully reported, a *weekly* issue of the *Victorian Standard* [it is a monthly publication] should be printed and circulated among the lodges."[48] This was accordingly done.

"MARRYING PAPISTS."

(*c*) *Protestants who Marry Catholics.*—Portion of Rule 2 (quoted above) runs as follows: "No person who . . . has married one [a Catholic] shall be admitted into the institution. . . . Any member marrying a Roman Catholic shall be expelled." This rule prevents the class of Protestants referred to from being either candidates for, or members of, the Orange institution. The rule is rigidly enforced. Mr. G. Gwynne, an Orangeman, who, at his own request, and on behalf of the Irish Grand Lodge, gave evidence regarding the rules, etc., of the institution before the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the great Belfast Riots of 1857, said: "Whenever a *charge* is brought against a member of marrying a Roman Catholic, *he is uniformly expelled.*"[49] They apparently do not even wait for *proof* of the charge. Mr. Gwynne was high in the

proved so exceedingly lucrative that the profession has been for the past few years uncomfortably crowded. The action of the law courts in England, Scotland, and America has somewhat reduced the congestion, and resulted in a considerable number of "ex-priests" and "ex-nuns"—*many of whom were proved to be members of various Protestant Churches*—being placed *in locum suum*, under lock and key in jail. Among these were sundry favourites of the American Orange association, the A.P.A., which has, in consequence, recently sent a circular to its lodges to have nothing further to do with "ex-priests," "ex-nuns," etc. The writer has in his possession a large amount of information dealing with particulars of the cases here referred to in general terms.

[48] *Victorian Standard*, 1st November, 1886.

[49] *Minutes of Evidence*, etc., Q. 8404.

confidence of the Grand Lodge, and he declared, moreover, that he knew the private lodges "minutely and extensively in every part of the kingdom."[50] The promptness with which a mere accusation of marrying a Papist is acted upon in the Orange society, is further evidenced by what took place at a meeting of the "Chosen Few" lodge (No. 2), Melbourne, November 12, 1896, as reported in the *Victorian Standard*: "A report was received in the matter of a member who *was stated* to have married a Roman Catholic. The report *tended* to confirm the statement, and the secretary was instructed to communicate with the *alleged* offender, summoning him to appear and say why he should not be *recommended for expulsion*."[51]

The reports of the proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Ireland for May, 1855; November, 1855; May, 1856; and November, 1856 (which lie before me),[52] contain an endless number of entries like the following: "County Antrim—Expulsion—Thomas Baird, lodge 654, *for marrying a Papist*." The Royal Commissioners say in their *Report*[53]: "Similar expressions are very numerous in the proceedings handed to us. This strongly expressed feeling against so large a class of their fellow-countrymen seems a perilous bond of union for a virtually secret society, embracing within it so largely the uneducated classes of society." During the debate on the Party Processions Act, Mr. M'Carthy Downing, on the 30th March, 1870, referred to the printed proceedings of the Irish Grand Lodge for 1869, which showed that, in Armagh county alone during that year, twenty-three Orangemen were expelled for the crime of marrying Papists.[54]

We have already seen how candidates, on their initiation to the Orange degree, have to take what is tantamount to an oath that they will not marry a Catholic, or permit any child of theirs to do so. The determination of Orangemen to exclude from the lodges, at all costs, everything which savours of friendly feeling towards their "Roman Catholic *brethren*," finds vigorously frank expression in the two following rules of the Victorian society (1893). Rule 14 runs thus:

"14. Any member guilty of an offence of *an aggravated character against religion or morality*, or of *habitual drunkenness*, shall be [only] *liable* to expulsion." Rule 1 peremptorily orders:

---

[50] *Ibid.*, Q. 8347.

[51] *Victorian Standard*, November 30, 1896. Deputy Grand Master R T. Vale presided at the meeting with the Master of the lodge.

[52] Appendix to *Report* of Royal Commission of Inquiry, 1857.

[53] Pp. 9, 10.

[54] *Hansard*, vol. ii., of first session, 1870, p. 953.

"Any member marrying a Roman Catholic *shall be expelled.*" Comment is quite unnecessary.

The feeling of Orangemen with regard to *Protestants* who marry Papist wives is strongly, if inelegantly, expressed in an Ulster lodge ditty, given in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1896:

> "Let no loyal *Protestant* e'er have it said,
> That he to a Papist wife e'er should get wed,
> *She's hateful, deceitful, she'll prove false to thee,*
> *She's worse than the devil, if worse there can be.*"

A Protestant Edwin who marries a Papist Angelina lays himself open to the *suspicion* of entertaining kindly feelings to Catholics.

No Protestant that "marries a Papist" need apply.

LIBERAL-MINDED PROTESTANTS.

(*d*) By the term "liberal-minded Protestants," I mean those who were known to have a kindly feeling for their Catholic neighbours; who advocated the extension of equal civil rights to four-fifths of the population of Ireland; who, as magistrates or police officers, tried to prevent *illegal* Orange processions, or to protect Papists from insult, violence, or outrage; or who disapproved of the scandalous partiality of Orange magistrates and juries, which has been sternly denounced by successive judges, from Fletcher in 1814 to Day in 1886, and which forms such a dark blot on the administration of justice in Ulster to the present day. All down the course of Orange history these classes of liberal Protestants have been pursued by Orangemen with a vindictive hatred of scarcely less intensity than that which they have shown to Catholics themselves. "Papist" is the favourite term which Orangemen have ever applied to liberal-minded Protestants. I need only refer to a few out of the endless instances which were deposed to on oath before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges:

Two Protestant Viceroys, Lords Wellesley and Anglesey, were vilified, and termed "Papist Wellesley" and "Papist Anglesey" for having dared to entertain opinions favourable to Catholic Emancipation. The former was violently assaulted, a bottle and other missiles being flung at him, amidst Orange cries, by brethren of lodge 1612, on the 14th December, 1822.[55] This event is still known in Dublin history as "the bottle riot." The Grand Lodge of Ireland expelled two clergymen and others who had dared to vote for the Reform candi-

[55] *Minutes of Evidence.* Cf. *History of Orangeism*, pp. 157, 158.

dates in the elections of 1831.[56] The "loyal" Orange yeomanry of Lurgan mutinied against a Presbyterian officer whose only fault was that he had signed a petition in favour of Catholic Emancipation. The conduct of the mutineers was so outrageous, even in the presence of Lieutenant-General Mackenzie, that the corps had to be disbanded.[57] Lord Caledon was assailed and hooted as a "Papist" for having refused to preside at an Orange demonstration at Dungannon, 19th December, 1834. The Ulster Protestant magistrates, Handcock, Wilson, Brownlow, Strong, Lord Caledon, and many others, the Protestant Police Inspectors, Sir Frederick Stoven, Captains Duff, Crofton, etc., were termed "Papists," vilified, shot at, burned in effigy, etc.; while in some instances their property was destroyed, because they had issued warrants against Orange rioters or murderers, attempted to stop *illegal* processions of armed brethren, endeavoured to do justice to Catholics on the bench, etc.[58] Ex-Sheriff Scott, of Dublin, was termed a "Papist," and expelled from the society by the Grand Lodge, for having invited O'Connell to breakfast.[59] The present Anglican Primate of Ireland was, in 1887, insulted on the occasion of his inviting the distinguished author, Justin M'Carthy, M.P., to dine at his palace in the city of Derry, when he was bishop of the united Anglican sees of Derry and Raphoe.[60] Many Ulster men will remember the angry correspondence that took place in the Belfast morning papers, in 1882, when Weir, Marshall, and other Orange farmers, of Kinego and Bondhill, in furtherance of the interests of their class, joined the Land League, and became thereby "rebels" and "Papists," and were expelled from the society as traitors to the Orange cause.[61]

THE QUEEN AND HER CROWN.

Orangemen will not permit even the Sovereign of the Realm to manifest a friendly feeling towards his or her Catholic subjects. Witness the uproar of the lodges against the signing of the Emancipation Bill in 1829,[62] the condemnation of which

[56] *Minutes of Evidence.* Qq. 1939, 1940.

[57] *Ibid.* Qq. 3773-4; 7913 *sqq.*, and Appendix B. 9.

[58] *Minutes of Evidence.* Qq. 3938, 4522, 4526, 5641, 7920, 8157, 8160, and Appendix C.6 *c.*, p. 139.

[59] The resolution of the Grand Lodge is given in the *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 1943.

[60] The following words were chalked on the walls of his palace on the occasion: "Ichabod! Thy glory is departed." See *Derry Journal* of that date.

[61] Portion of the correspondence on the subject is quoted by "M.P." in *History of Orangeism*, p. 268.

[62] The riots and uproar continued well on into the thirties, and evoked the Party Processions Act of 1832. Threats of armed insurrection were

finds a vigorous echo to this day in the official organs of the Orange society.[63]

The still more vigorous outcry of the brethren against their Queen on the occasion of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the death of party ascendency, in 1869, is a matter of history. A clergyman, Rev. "Flaming" Flanagan, declared at an Orange meeting at Newbliss (county Monaghan), March 20th, 1868, that if the Disestablishment Bill received the Royal assent they would "kick the Queen's crown into the Boyne." This saying became a watchword among Orangemen during the remainder of the agitation.

A favourite contention of the Orange platform was this: That the signing of the Emancipation and Disestablishment Bills would be a violation of the Sovereign's coronation oath. Rev. Mr. Flanagan bluntly declared at Newbliss that, by signing the latter Bill, the Queen would "perjure herself." "We must," said he, "tell our most gracious Queen that, *if she break her oath, she has no longer a claim to the Crown.*"[64] A large body of Orange clergymen, lawyers, Grand Lodge officers, etc., whose words lie before me, made use of language scarcely less forcible than that of Mr. Flanagan, during the Disestablishment agitation in 1868 and 1869.

A faint echo of the platform thunders of '68 and '69 has penetrated even to this remote colony of the Empire. Should the files of the *Victorian Standard* (the lodge organ) ever reach the royal reading desk, Her Majesty will undoubtedly be deeply concerned to learn that her Protestantism will not pass muster with some, at least, of her Orange subjects in Victoria. A Worshipful Master, at the Rochester demonstration in 1893, condemned the Queen and her daughter for having dared to be present "at a Popish and idolatrous ceremony."[65] At the

---

made as frequently as in 1868 and 1869. As far back as 1810, during the trial of Howard, an Orange yeoman, for murder, at the Kilkenny assizes, the prosecutor elicited from another yeoman (a witness) that he felt himself absolved from his allegiance, should the King grant Emancipation to the Catholics ("M.P.," p. 139. Cf. *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report*).

[63]For instance, in *Victorian Standard*, editorial paragraph. May, 1893, p. 6, col. 1. Cf. chap. ix., *infra*, near end.

[64]An extended report of this speech is given in the *Northern Whig*, March 21, 1868. The files of the *Daily Express* (the chief Dublin organ of the lodges) for 1868 and 1869, abound in similar language.

[65]*Victorian Standard*, July, 1893, p. 10, first column. Is her Majesty the Queen a Papist—or still worse—a Jesuit, in disguise? At any rate her whole conduct is a daily and hourly outrage on Orangeism, which, we are assured, is simply "Protestantism in earnest." A recent list of her Privy Councillors contains the names of six Catholics. She—without protest—allows her Catholic Generals, Butler, Dillon, etc., to win battles for her, a Catholic admiral (White) to help to "rule the Queen's navee;"

Kyneton Orange anniversary, in 1888, Rev. Mr. Johnson is reported by the *Victorian Standard* to have read a letter, in which "the fact [was] deplored that their Protestant Queen had sent presents to her own and *God's enemy* [the Pope]—had sent him the very vestments to celebrate that idolatrous service, the Mass, and exchanged with him compliments and good wishes."[66] In its editorial matter, the *Victorian Standard* has held up to the odium of the brethren the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal Family, for "dallying with the dragon"—that is, for the evidences of the friendly spirit which they have from time to time displayed towards the Catholic Church.[67] The Queen and her family are evidently not Protestants of "the right sort."

The editor of the same lodge organ thus applies his cat-o'-nine tails to those "namby-pamby" Protestants who believe in living at peace with their Catholic neighbours: "The aggressiveness of the harlot Church [of Rome] is apparently too irresistable for the paltering *pseudo*-Protestants of the present age, whose unstrung backbones collapse at the mere though of resisting the domination of Rome."[68] Numberless other instances of the intense bitterness of Orangemen towards liberal-minded Protestants will be found in the *Reports* of the Parliamentary Committees of 1835; in the histories of the

and a Catholic statesman (Lord Ripon) to rule India better than any of his predecessors. Her Lord Chamberlain is a Catholic. Cardinal Vaughan is invited by her and the Prince of Wales to royal garden parties; and she purchases pictures from the Catholic artists, Mr. Herbert, R.A., and Miss Alice Havers. She has been guilty, in 1895, and 1896, of presenting vestments to a Catholic church, and linen to Nazareth House, Hammersmith, besides allowing her grand-daughter to be married, by the Pope's dispensation, to a member of the Catholic House of Hohenzollern. The marriage was followed by a solemn High Mass, at which the Prince of Wales and numerous members of the Royal Family were present. Princess Maude, also, accepted a present of a valuable antique gold bracelet from the Man of Sin. According to the *Daily Chronicle*, Queen Victoria sent a cordial reply to the Pope's congratulations on her attaining the longest reign in English history.

[66] *Victorian Standard*, August, 1888, p. 7, col. 2.

[67] See, for instance, *Victorian Standard* for May, 1893, p. 3., col. 1. The Prince is condemned in strong terms for the marked esteem in which he holds "the apostate Manning." The Princess and her son are likewise lectured for having visited "the head of the Popish Church in Rome." The "editor's notes" continue: "Will the English, Scotch, Irish, and colonial Protestants open their eyes to this fraternising with Rome, and denounce the acts as they should before it is too late?" On September 1, 1860, the Prince of Wales refused to accept the "proffered hospitality" of the Mayor and Corporation of Kingston, Toronto, "on account of the extent to which they had permitted *their Orange zeal* to interfere with the invitation." Irving's *Annuals of Our Times, 1837-1871*, p. 583. Cf. Chambers' *Encyclopædia* and McClintock's *Cyclopædia*, arts. "Orangemen."

[68] *Ibid*, p. 6.

Emancipation, Reform, Education, Repeal, Franchise, and other movements, and in the *Reports* of the Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the Belfast and Derry sectarian riots of 1857, 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886. Kindly feeling towards Catholics disqualifies from membership of the Orange association.

No liberal-minded Protestant need apply.

"BANEFUL AND UNCHRISTIAN."

To the average Orangeman, liberal-minded Protestants are "Papists," or little better than Papists. It may be interesting to know what some of these latter think of the peculiar form of Christianity which passes for Protestantism in the lodges.

The Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1835 to inquire into Orangeism in Great Britain and the colonies, was composed of twenty-three members, only two of whom (Mr. Finn and Hon. Lalor Sheil) were Catholics. In their *Report* to Parliament (p. xxvi.) they express themselves as "anxiously desirous of seeing the United Kingdom and the colonies of the Empire freed from the *baneful and unchristian influence* of the Orange societies." The following extract from the same *Report* will sufficiently determine what, in their eyes, constituted one factor in the "unchristian influence" of the lodges:

"The obvious tendency and effect of the Orange institution is, to keep up an exclusive association in civil and military society, exciting one portion of the people against the other; to increase the rancour and animosity too often unfortunately existing between persons of different religious persuasions—to make the Protestant the enemy of the Catholic, and the Catholic the enemy of the Protestant." The truth of this official utterance will become apparent as we proceed.

Dr. Killen, the Presbyterian historian, describes the early Orangemen as "the very scum of society, and a disgrace to Protestantism."[69] On the 5th July, 1832, Lord Caledon (a Protestant), wrote to Col. Verner denying the Colonel's assertion that "the word Orangemen means Protestants generally," and concluding thus: "I consider the Orange system as tending to disunite us [Protestants], when our religion alone should be a sufficient bond for union."[70] Miss Harriet Martineau says that, in one of the English Grand Lodge circulars,[71] "the position of the [Established] Church in the eyes of Orangemen of the period is described in language too indecent for publication," and she wonders what "theory of

[69] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. 2, p. 359, *note*.

[70] Quoted by him in full before Parl. Committee of 1835; Q. 5473; cf. Qq. 3535, 3885, 3992.

[71] *Appeal to the Conservatives of England*, given in Appendix 5, p. 92, to English *Report*; cf. Q. 2862.

Christianity" such men can hold.[72] The Earl of Gosford, who had witnessed the progress of Orangeism since 1795, declared before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, that, so far from being necessary for the defence of Protestantism, it rather weakened it.[73] Sir Frederick Stoven a Protestant, and Inspector-General of Constabulary, deposed before the same Committee that Orangeism was the cause of religious dissension, and was absolutely injurious to the cause of religion.[74] Mr. James Sinclair, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, stated that the society was productive of very injurious consequences to the Protestant religion.[75] The *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1836, dealing with the evidence placed before the Parliamentary Committees of the previous year, says: "There can be no doubt that Orangeism has been, and continues to be, hurtful to the very cause and principles which *it professes* to support. Our charges against it are: That it has rendered Protestantism weaker than it found it; that it has fomented hostile and intolerant feelings between co-sects of the Christian religion," etc. In 1820, the rules of the society were revised, pursuant to a resolution which stated that practices had been adopted in the order "offensive to common decency."[76]

I must end somewhere. The difficulty consists in choosing extracts out of the abundant materials available under this head. The reader will note that here, as throughout the rest of these pages, the strongest condemnation of the principles and practices of the Orange association is that which comes, not from Catholic, but from Protestant, sources.

In all its records I have failed to find a single instance in which—even at the height of its wealth and power—the Orange society ever turned aside from the cherished task of fomenting sectarian strife, to found or endow even one solitary hospital, one home for the aged, one orphanage, one free school, one college, one university; or that it ever sent a missionary to the heathen, or a voice to speak of Christ to the dwellers in the slums. Where are the trophies of its Christianity? To sum up:

1. The Orange society rigidly excludes Catholics from membership.

2. It excludes from membership all Protestants who are open to even the suspicion of entertaining kindly feelings towards Catholics.

---

[72] *The Thirty Year's Peace*, vol. ii., pp. 273, 274.
[73] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 3535. Cf. Qq. 3474, 3885, 3992.
[74] *Ibid.*, Qq. 4627, 4630, 4651, 4700, 4703.
[75] *Ibid.*, Q. 4967.
[76] Healey's *Word for Ireland*, p. 148.

3. Membership is thus practically limited to the more intolerant classes of Protestants. The reader has already seen that Orangeism is recruited very largely from the "lower orders" and "the uneducated classes of society."[77]

4. Their intolerance must be active. They are required by their "qualifications" to "resist," and to "strenuously oppose" the Church of Rome. In the eighth and following chapters we shall see that this antagonism includes press and platform attacks of a peculiarly gross nature on the whole Catholic body, and an incessant warfare against their religious and political rights and liberties.

Here we have the crude materials of intolerance in, so to speak, the nebular state. The next two chapters will deal with the forces which mould them into shape; the guiding minds which direct their activities along their appointed course.

[77] Killen and others, quoted above, chap. iv.

Chapter VI.

WHEELS WITHIN WHEELS—HOW THE SECRET IS GUARDED: OATHS, TESTS, SIGNS, AND PASSWORDS —A MESSAGE FROM THE KING—ORANGEMEN IN THE WITNESS-BOX AND AT THE BAR OF THE HOUSE: LODGE LAW V. CIVIL LAW.

"A THING that will not bear the light of investigation, has no right to live." So spoke Grand Chaplain Rev. H. Heathershaw to the brethren at Kew (Victoria), as reported in the lodge organ, the *Victorian Standard*, of August 31, 1896. In treating of the organisation of the Orange institution, we must ever bear in mind that we are dealing with "a thing that will not bear investigation"—with a secret society which has successfully baffled the attempts made, even by the British Parliament, to penetrate into certain dark corners of its hidden policy and methods. Such secrecy furnishes, by itself, and *à priori*, grounds of distrust. Poisonous fungi and woodleeches hug the deep shade of the lonely forest. We not unreasonably suspect associations of our fellow-men when their operations —like those of the thief, burglar, and assassin—must be conducted under a cloak of secrecy. "Woe," said the prophet, "to them that are deep of heart, whose works are in the dark, and who say: Who seeth us, and who knoweth us?"[1] St. Paul reminds us that we are "light in the Lord," and bids us walk as children of the light.[2] But, above all, the Saviour of mankind spoke words so distinct that one might almost suppose they were directed against such unlawful associations: "Everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, that his works may not be reproved."[3]

This *à priori* suspicion that attaches to mystery of this kind is increased by even a moderate acquaintance with the recorded doings of secret societies, such as the Illuminati, the Sons of Satan, the Carbonari, the Know-nothings (the Orangemen of the United States), the Communists, the International, the Nihilists, the bomb-throwing Anarchists, the

[1] *Is.*, xxxix., 15.
[2] *Thess.*, v., 5; *Eph.*, v., 8, etc.
[3] *St. John*, iii., 20.

Luciferians, the Mala Vita, and the rest.[4] Their records prove that they have almost uniformly masked their real aims and methods by fair-sounding phrases and by fine professions, like the "qualifications" and the "basis" of Orangeism, which the Parliamentary Committees of 1835 and the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 proved to be as empty as the bubbles blown by schoolboys.

M. Hamon has recently written a book[5] to prove that the "qualifications" of the anarchists who are scattering explosives all over Europe are "love of liberty," "tender-heartedness," "a sense of logic," "a feeling of justice," "love of others," and "a thirst for knowledge!" Such fair professions are but the decent drapery with which dark-lantern associations conceal ultimate aims and methods of work which, if exposed to the light of day, would shock all friends of peace and order. In 1835, when the secrets of the Orange institution were for the first time laid bare to the world, the association was in the zenith of its power, numbering 20 grand lodges, 80 district lodges, 1,500 private lodges, and—in England and Ireland alone—from 340,000 to 360,000 members, of every class in society up to the Imperial Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland. The result of the exposure was that the English lodges were dissolved, the "respectability" of the Irish lodges gradually diminished, until at the present time their membership is mainly confined to "the very lowest classes in the North of Ireland."[6]

SECRECY.

Secrecy was from the outset, and is to the present day, a vital rule of the Orange institution. *The Early Ordinances of the Armagh Orangemen* (King: Dublin, 1801) say: "Our society *being a secret one* . . any Orangeman introducing same [Papists], or making known the secrets of our body to such Papists, will be treated by us as a renegade and a perjurer, and in all respects like to a Papist."[7] The English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 term it in their *Report* a secret society. Colonel Verner and Rev. Holt Waring admitted before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that secrecy was one of the first rules of the Orange institution. The Dublin

---

[4]The reader is referred to Frost's *Secret Societies of the European Revolution, The Secret Warfare*, etc., English edition (Burns and Oates); *The Wars and Revolutions of Italy*, etc., by Count Lubienski.

[5]*Psychologie de l'Anarchiste-Socialiste*, Paris, 1896.

[6]*Chambers' Encyclop.*, art. "Orangemen." Compare Killen's *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 465; *Report* of Royal Commission, Belfast, 1857, pp. 9, 10.

[7]Quoted by "M.P.", *History of Orangeism*, p. 81.

Daily Express—the friend of the Orange party—declared it to be still, in 1857, "a secret political society, unfit for an age such as this;" and again, that "the Orange institution is a secret one, unknown to the law, antagonistic in principle to the larger portion of the people," etc. A second article by the same paper on the same subject says: "There is one thing connected with Orangeism which we hold to be utterly unworthy of a free country, nurtured by Protestantism and the British Constitution, and that is its *secrecy*. What should Protestants have to say to each other which they must whisper in private lodges, as if they dwelt in a land cursed by despotism and espionage, dogged by *gens d'armes?* Why should honourable, high-spirited gentlemen and brave-hearted yeomen stoop to the self-imposed necessity of communicating with each other by secret signs and passwords?"[8] According to the *Ararat* [Victoria] *Advertiser* of July 19, 1892, Rev. (afterwards Grand Chaplain) Heathershaw, speaking at a demonstration in that town, said: "If people chose, it might be said that it was a secret society;" and the Orange tract before referred to admits and justifies its secrecy, as a means "to secure united action and a vote on all important occasions."[9]

The principal means adopted for safe-guarding the secrets of the lodge are the following:

1. The division of members into various orders or "degrees"—Orange, Purple, Black Preceptory, etc.—each having its own set of jealously-guarded secrets, signs, passwords.

2. Oaths, tests, secret signs, and passwords; "tyling" or guarding the lodge doors during the deliberations of members, etc.

3. Concealment of the books and documents of the lodge.

1. Colonel Verner admitted before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that the Purple or higher degree of the private lodges was instituted expressly "for the purpose of excluding improper persons."[10] This is a well-known device of secret societies. It keeps the criminal schemes of the lodges, which would not bear the light, within the power of a small clique of leaders, and safe from the great body of the associates, to whom it might not be prudent to commit them. The revised rules of 1845 require absolute secrecy from all, and add "that a Purple-man, before being initiated, should be distinctly known to be a man who would not reveal things confided to him, *even to an*

[8] Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 237-238. The articles appeared in consequence of Lord Chancellor Brady's order, refusing the Commission of the Peace to Orangemen, in 1857.

[9] *Definition of Orangeism.*

[10] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 471. He would not reveal the Purple signs (Q. 511), which, he stated, were unknown to mere Orangemen (Qq. 476, 492).

Orangeman."[11] An oath to this effect appears in the rules of 1800. It is termed the Purple Marksman's obligation. Part of this oath runs as follows: "I, A.B., of my own free will and accord, in the presence of Almighty God, do hereby most solemnly and sincerely swear that . . . . *I will keep this part of a Marksman from an Orangeman*, as well as from the ignorant."[12]

In the Irish revised rules of 1849, the following are laid down as the qualifications of a Purple-man: "He should be one who may be depended on *to keep all matters and all things confided to him, as a Purple-man, even from an Orangeman*, as well as from a stranger to the Orange institution."[13] Purple-men have to this day a series of secret signs and passwords which are unknown to the mere members of the Orange degree.

OATHS, ETC.

2. The rules of 1800 contain two oaths of secrecy, the one referred to above, and the following: "And I do further swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that I will always conceal, and never will reveal, either part or parts of this that I am now about to receive, neither write it, indite it, stamp, stain, nor engrave it, nor cause it so to be done on paper, parchment, leaf, bark, brick, stone, or anything, so that it might be known."[14] Oaths of secrecy were retained in the revised rules of 1814 and 1824.[15]

After the "bottle riot," which took place in Dublin on the 14th of December, 1822, the Orange assailants of the Protestant Viceroy, "Papist" Wellesley, were placed upon their trial. There were general and serious charges that the jury was packed with those who were known to be "good men in bad times." A Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to investigate the matter. Sir Abraham B. King—who had been an Orangeman since 1797—was questioned as to the signs and oaths of the fraternity. He declined to divulge them; threatened with the displeasure of the House, he still persisted in his refusal. The *Report* of the English Parliamentary Select Committee copies from the records of the English Grand Lodge of June 16th, 1823, a vote

[11] Rules of 1845, in Madden's *Lives and Times*, etc.; also published as separate pamphlet, Dublin, 1861.

[12] In Appendix to Parliamentary *Report* of 1835. The Purple signs are not revealed to Orangemen. *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 476, 492.

[13] The Irish rules of 1849 are given in full in Appendix 14 to *Report* of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast riots of 1857, *q.v.*, p. 275.

[14] English Parliamentary Committee's *Report* of 1835, p. 6; Plowden, *loc. cit., supra*.

[15] *Ibid.* Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*, p. 183, *note* 2 (113).

of thanks passed by that body to Sir Abraham, for the "gentlemanly, firm, and conscientious conduct he displayed at the bar of the House of Commons" on the occasion referred to.

These oaths, signs, and tests have been made illegal by 50th George III., cap. 102; the 4th George IV., cap. 87; 2nd and 3rd Victoria, cap. 64; 8th and 9th Victoria, cap. 55. The only apparent effect of these Acts was to remove the oaths and tests from the books of rules, etc., of the Orange institution. In 1813 the state of the law made it prudent to alter the *printed* rules of the English Grand Lodge. On the 4th of August of that year a committee was appointed for the purpose of enabling the brethren (as the Grand Secretary frankly put it) "to elude the grasp" of the law. Under no circumstances, however, could they see how the secret signs and passwords "can be dispensed with."[16] In December, 1821, the English Grand Lodge consulted Mr. Sergeant Lens as to the legality of the institution in the existing state of the law. In the course of his reply, he said: "The secret signs and symbols, which may be changed from time to time, I cannot help thinking, are objectionable, and if any question were hereafter to arise on the *legality of* its [the society's] proceedings, might be urged as *a circumstance* of *great suspicion*."[17]

The use of secret signs, by means of which Orangemen may recognise a brother in a crowd, continues in full force to the present day. The wearing of a five-pointed metallic star as a watch-guard pendant is, at the present time (1897), one means to that end in Victoria.[18] Canon D. M. Berry, incumbent of Trinity Church, East Melbourne, in a speech which he is reported to have delivered at a meeting of his lodge (No. 33, Duke of Sussex) said: "He (the Canon) desired to add that he had but a poor memory for faces and names, and if he should meet any of them out of the lodge, and fail to recognise them, all they had to do was to *give him the grip*, and then recognition would take place."[19] Grips and such-like secret signs are among the many items of lodge ceremonial which find no place in the *printed* rules or ritual of the institution.

In October, 1826, in consequence of the disclosure of the signs and passwords of the time, a number of the brethren were

---

[16] Appendix to *Report* of English Parl. Committee, p. 179, and Mr. R. Nixon's letter to the Earl of Yarmouth.

[17] Appendix to English Committee's *Report*. Cf. *Minutes of Evidence* (Lord Kenyon's), Qq. 2, 6, 7, etc.

[18] After their annual elections in November, 1896, a number of these ornaments were presented by various lodges to their retiring officers. *Victorian Standard*, November 30, 1896.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 11. The same paper, in its issue of June 30, 1897, tells how a candidate, on his initiation, "received the signs, password, and grip."

expelled: new rules and a new system of signs were adopted, which continued in force until 1834. Up till 1835 (the year of the Parliamentary inquiry into Orangeism) oaths and declarations—all of which were decidedly illegal—continued to be administered in the lodges on the initiation of members.[20] The oath of *secrecy* had been—in consequence of the pressure of the law—excised from the *printed* rules. Secrecy was, however, as effectually secured as ever by methods to which further reference will be made in the course of this chapter.

In consequence of the grave character of the disclosures elicited by the Parliamentary Committees of 1835, the House of Commons, on the 23rd of February, 1836, *unanimously* prayed the King (on the motion of Lord John Russell), to put down Orange societies. In his reply, the King called upon all his "loyal subjects" to aid him in his efforts for "the effectual discouragement of Orange societies, and generally, of all political societies excluding persons of different religious faith, using signs and symbols, and acting by associated branches."[21] In consequence of the action of the King and of Parliament, a Treasury Minute was issued, dated March 13, 1836, ordering that all Civil Servants who should become or continue members of the Orange association, should be dismissed. I shall deal more fully with this subject in a later chapter.

IN THE WITNESS-BOX.

In spite of the known illegality of oaths, tests, etc., there is abundant evidence to show that they were in use in the Orange lodges long after their disappearance from the *printed* rules and rituals of the association. The revised Irish rules of 1849 provide for "a test" (not specified), which is deemed "important and desirable." A wide scope for illegal practices of this kind is, perhaps not undesignedly, furnished to the society, by the rule which entitles all private lodges to make by-laws for themselves, with no other restriction than that such by-laws shall not be "inconsistent with the [printed?] laws of the institution," and that they shall be confirmed by the Grand Lodge.[22] In his examination before the Belfast Royal Commission, Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen professed total ignorance of the existence of secret signs, etc., in the Orange society. The Commissioners, however, declined to accept his statement, and referred to the evidence of Mr. George Stewart Hill and others as positive proof that these

[20] *Report* of English Committee.
[21] See Hansard, Third Series, vol. xxxi., pp. 332, 345, 779, 859.
[22] Rule 68 of the *Laws and Constitution* of the Victorian Lodges, 1893.

things "still exist in the very classes of society where they are most dangerous."[23] Mr. George Stewart Hill was a Sub-Inspector of constabulary. He swore that he knew, "from his experience as a police officer," that the Orange society had "secret signs."[24] Robert Blair, an Orangeman (member of lodge No. 553, Dundrod), after the usual hedging and loss of memory so characteristic of the brethren when in the witness-box, swore that he had received the signs and passwords "from the Master" [of the lodge].[25] He was further asked by the Royal Commissioners of 1857:

"Q. 7767: You were sworn when you entered the lodge? *Of course* I was sworn when I entered the lodge."

"Q. 7772: What were you sworn on? *I was sworn on the New Testament.*" (He repeated this statement at Q. 7775).

William John Cleland—another Orangeman—was examined by the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857. He admitted having taken an oath in the Orange lodge, *but absolutely refused to divulge what it bound him to.*[26] He granted that he would know an Orange sign if he saw it.[27] He, however, positively refused to give any further information as to the signs, passwords, etc.[28] When urged by the Commissioners to answer the questions put to him, he said: "I would be very sorry, honourable gentlemen, to refuse to answer you any question; *but if you knew anything about the* [Orange] *system, you know I should not answer that.*"

Similar evidence was elicited from equally unwilling witnesses at the inquiry held in Magherafelt, in April, 1874, regarding the riots of Bellaghy and Castledawson. John Martin, who had been "fifteen years an Orangeman," admitted, under great pressure: "There are secret signs and passwords in connection with the Orange institution, *and that is all I will tell you.*" Martin Davidson, Master of lodge 1511—when at length prevailed upon by the court to answer—corroborated Martin's evidence by saying: "*Of course* there are secret signs and passwords in connection with the Orange society."

[23] *Report*, pp. 10, 11.

[24] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 7281-7287. His uncle was, according to the evidence, Master of a lodge.

[25] *Ibid.*, Qq. 7739, 7759.

[26] *Ibid.*, Qq. 7818-7819. In this same year—1857—the Dublin *Daily Express* (the mouthpiece of the Orange party), in a leader on Lord Chancellor Brady's order, asks the pregnant question: "By what right does the Orange society *impose an oath* to bind the consciences of Christian men?" Quoted by "M.P.," *History of Orangeism*, p. 238.

[27] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 7811.

[28] *Ibid.*, Qq. 7804, 7806. Mr. W. S. Tracy, a magistrate, and Head-Constable Henderson had both reason to believe in the existence of secret signs, etc. Qq. 448, *sqq.*

Andrew Kennedy, a member of lodge 96 (Castledawson), said he was not aware that he "ever knew an Orangeman who had not the signs and passwords." His evidence also shows that he *took an oath* as an Orangeman. William Gray, another very unsatisfactory Orange witness, admitted the existence of secret signs and passwords in the lodges. He believed they always came from Dublin. They were given to him by the Master of the lodge. His evidence also shows that he likewise took an oath at his initiation as member of the Orange association.[29] The free-and-easy manner in which the brethren coquette with the Oaths Act is illustrated by a "scheme" issued in 1884 by the Master of Dyan lodge "for the better organization of the Orange society as a fighting force." It is given in full in the first two pages of Healy's *Loyalty plus Murder*, and contains the following: "That on enrolment each man should be re-attached (as in the case of militia reserve men), and *sworn* to obey the orders of the District Master or Council." Apart from their general policy of secrecy, there are other urgent grounds for the blushing reluctance of the loyal brethren to confess, in courts of justice, the soft impeachment of the initiation oath: under British law, persons who take or administer such unlawful oaths are liable to penal servitude for seven years.[30] In Ireland the signs and passwords are altered (I think) annually by the Grand Lodge; in the federated lodges of Australia they are changed at the triennial meetings of the Grand Council.[31] In Canada, in 1882, the Supreme Court judges (*in re* Grant *v.* the Mayor of Montreal) decided that the Orange society "is an illegal body, and its members may be prosecuted and found guilty, for the reason that *the Orange oath* enjoins secrecy."[32] Some readers may find a significance in the declaration made, according to the *Victorian Standard*, by a prominent speaker at the Melbourne Orange anniversary of 1893: "We [Orangemen] *have taken a solemn oath* to do our best to follow the example and

[29]The verbatim report of the evidence referred to above will be found in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 261, 263.

[30]Harris's *Principles of the Criminal Law*, 6th ed., pp. 53, 54.

[31]The *Victorian Standard* of April 30, 1897, has the following in the course of a brief report of the triennial meeting of the Grand Council of Australasia: "The Signs and Passwords Committee, consisting of Bro. Edwards, G.M., S.A.; Bartlett, D.G.M., Vic.; and Mathews, D.G.M., Tas., reported as to the selection of passwords for the next three years, and the same was adopted." In the course of a speech made at the Grand Lodge luncheon in Melbourne, in November, 1896, Grand Secretary J. A. Baker "regretted . . . that while Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, and South Australia had one common password, New South Wales should have a different one. He thought *all* the Australian lodges should admit on one common password." *Victorian Standard* report, November 30, 1896.

[32]Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 297.

teaching of Christ."[33] It is needless to say that there is not a hint about the Irish practice of taking *formal* oaths at initiation in any of the rule-books or rituals since 1835, nor in those now current among the lodges of Australia. But it by no means follows that oaths are, therefore, not in use among the colonial lodges. As in 1813 and 1834, the brethren know how to avoid, as well as how to bend before, a storm. When some feature of the Orange rule-book becomes illegal, or if, when known (as in the case of the Victorian election rules of 1885),[34] it is likely to create a feeling against the society, it is quietly excised from the *printed Laws and Constitution*, and is retained, unrepealed and under added safeguards, in one or other of the following forms:

(*a*) In the printed or written rituals of the order;
(*b*) In the written instructions of the Grand Lodge;
(*c*) In the by-laws, in the framing of which private lodges are allowed the widest scope, subject to the approval of the Grand Lodge (Rule 68).

In the two last-mentioned forms there is practically no risk, in the ritual (as I can testify from personal experience) very little risk, of the public getting into the secret. The rituals are (*a*) "printed exclusively under the directions of the Grand Lodge" (Rule 18); (*b*) only *one* ritual is issued by the Grand Lodge to each private lodge; (*c*) all rituals "are the property of the Grand Lodge," which has at any time the power to withdraw them (Rule 26); (*d*) the secretary of each lodge has to take an oath, or to "solemnly and sincerely declare," that he will neither give a copy of it nor lend it out of the lodge he belongs to. A glance at the current Victorian ritual in Appendix B reveals certain facts in connection with the working of Orangeism, which justify the precautions taken to keep this document in the hands of a few select and "safe" men.

GUARDING THE SECRET.

On his initiation into the society, the candidate for the Orange degree, after sundry exhortations, readings from Scripture, and other religious or mock-religious ceremonies,[35] *holds a Bible in his hand, kneels down* before the Worshipful Master and the assembled brethren, and solemnly makes a lengthy declaration, of which the following forms a part: "I do solemnly and sincerely declare . . . that I will not in *any* manner communicate or reveal, by word, act, or deed, *any* of the proceedings of my brother Orangemen in lodge assembled, nor *any*

[33] *Victorian Standard's* own report, July, 1893.
[34] See chapter vii., *infra*.
[35] See Appendix B.

matter or thing therein communicated to me, unless to a brother Orangeman, well knowing him to be such, *or until I shall have been authorised so to do by the Grand Lodge.*" The reader will note the sweeping character of this part of the "solemn declaration" (or oath) which the Grand Lodge requires every Orangeman to take. (1) He is solemnly bound not to reveal to outsiders in any manner, *any* proceeding that he witnesses, nor "*any* matter or thing" communicated to him. (2) This solemn promise (or oath) extends, by force of its wording, to courts of justice, and Parliamentary or other forms of official inquiry, no exception being made in their favour. The natural, and presumably intended, effect of this part of the "obligation" is as follows: Unless the Grand Lodge accords an Orange witness, under seal, written permission to give evidence on lodge proceedings, he must, by force of his solemn promise or oath, either (*a*) refuse to give evidence, and thus commit contempt of court; or (*b*) give false evidence, and thereby be guilty of perjury. As we proceed we shall see that both the leaders and the rank-and-file of the Orange society have uniformly adopted either the one or the other of these two means of defeating the ends of official inquiry.

Regarding the printed *declaration* of secrecy, I may remark:

(*a*) Fear of legal penalties would be sufficient to deter the leaders of the Orange association from inserting formal oaths in their *printed* ritual, even where, as in Ireland, such oaths have been admittedly administered and taken.

(*b*) Apart from legal requirements, which are not in question here, the form of words used in being sworn is of little moment, so long as one intends to take an oath, and is understood to do so by those who are present.

Touching the Bible was an old form of taking an oath. In the course of a recent letter to *The Times*, Sir Sherston Baker, Recorder of Barnstaple, said: "In ancient times a large folio Bible, containing the Gospels, was placed upon a stand in the view of the prisoner. The jurymen, who occupied a space set apart in the court, came forward one by one, and placed their hands upon the Book, and then the prisoner had a full view of the 'peer' who was to try him. This was called the 'corporal oath,' because the hand [*corpus*, body] of the person sworn touched the Book. Probably, out of reverence, the Book may have been kissed sometimes, as a Catholic priest now kisses the Book in the Mass; but I strongly doubt the kiss on the Book to be, or ever to have been, essential to the [legal] validity of the corporal oath." As a matter of fact, the Oaths' Act of 1888 allows witnesses to be sworn in English courts in

the Scotch fashion, with uplifted hand. A similar provision is made in the law-courts of Ireland and most, if not all, of the Australian colonies. The candidate for the Orange degree not merely touches the Bible, but holds it in his hand, when, on bended knees, he makes his "solemn declaration" at initiation.

(*c*) Referring to this subject of the declaration of secrecy required of candidates for the Orange degree, the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 say in their *Report* to the House of Commons: "The effect of the religious ceremonies and forms has been to enforce, *with the apparent sanction of an oath*, secrecy on the members admitted; as the Deputy Grand Master of England and Wales, and all the Orangemen examined by the Committee (with one exception), refused to communicate the secret signs and passwords; and it appears that a disclosure of the system by a member would subject him to expulsion."

We now understand one reason why an Orange witness at the Melbourne Post Office Inquiry of 1896 refused to give evidence.[36] He did not dare to do so without the special authorisation of the Grand Lodge. "I am not going to tell you," said the witness referred to, "what was done at a lodge I belong to, or anything of that sort." Said he again: "*affairs are spoken of at lodge meetings, which neither I nor any other brother would tell you.*" Lodge law thus calmly sets aside the civil law, which Orangemen solemnly declare themselves "resolved to support and defend to the utmost of their power."

The secretary's printed "obligation" at the present day is almost word for word the same as the oath taken by that functionary by the rules of 1800. It runs as follows, as will be seen by reference to Appendix B: "I, A.B., do solemnly and sincerely declare that I will, to the utmost of my power, *keep safe* the papers belonging to the lodge, and that I will not give any copy of the *articles*, or lend them to make an Orangeman out of the lodge I belong to, or lend the seal, so that it may be affixed to any forged papers, or irregular Orangeman's certificate." By Rule 26 all seals are "the property of the Grand Lodge," by whom they are issued to the private lodges, and by whom they may be recalled at any time. "All communications from any lodge shall have the seal affixed" (Rule 63.)

The Master and Deputy Master are required to "solemnly and sincerely declare" (in the words of the oath of 1800), that they have not "a sitting" in their houses for which they "hold a license to sell beer, spirits, or any other intoxicating liquor." Licensed victuallers have never been considered sufficiently "safe," by the reason of the nature of their business, to be

[36] See Preface.

entrusted with the higher secrets of even the private lodges. By the sanction of the Grand Lodge, the brethren may meet in public-houses, but only under the most stringent safeguards as to the secrecy of their proceedings.[37] The Grand Lodge, at least in Victoria, thus provides expressly in its rules for the constant violation of an Act of Parliament which forbids the holding of the meetings of such societies on the premises of licensed victuallers.[38] Pressmen were excluded from the Irish organisation during the fury of the anti-Disestablishment agitation in 1868.[39] When King Midas's servant had learned that his royal master had the ears of a donkey, the luckless wight knew no peace till he had unbosomed his dangerous secret to a hole in the earth. But, say the poets, out of the spot there sprung a thicket of reeds which whispered the tale to all the winds of heaven. It is doubtful if the mobile tongue of gentle and confiding woman could long retain the secret of the hidden deformity of the Orange society. Efforts were made from time to time to introduce female Orange lodges in Victoria. The *Victorian Standard*[40] briefly informs us that the proposal "met with its usual fate"—a short shrift and a long drop—at the hands of the Grand officials, who best know the reasons why the secrets, and especially the higher secrets, of the institution, should be in the possession of those only whose tongues would

---

[37] See Rule 17, Appendix C.

[38] Section 145 of the Licensing Act of 1890 (Victoria) is evidently intended, both by inclusion and by exclusion, to apply specially to the Orange society. The section runs as follows: "No licensed victualler shall permit any body union society assembly of persons declared to be illegal, or any body union society or assembly who require from persons on or before admission thereto any illegal oath test declaration or affirmation, or who observe on the admission of members or at any other proceeding any religious or pretended religious ceremony not sanctioned by law, or who wear carry about or display on assembly any arms flags colours symbols declarations or emblems whatsoever, to meet or assemble on any occasion or pretence whatsoever in the house premises or other place of sale of the victualler so licensed; nor shall the licensed victualler display or suffer to be displayed on from or out of any part of such premises any sign flag or symbol declaration or emblem whatsoever of any such body or society as aforesaid. And if any such licensed victualler offend against any of the provisions in this section contained, he shall forfeit and pay for every such offence any sum not less than Two pounds nor more than Five pounds. Provided that nothing herein shall apply to the societies or bodies of men called Freemasons Foresters Free Gardeners Ancient Druids Odd Fellows or to any benefit or friendly society." The holding of such meetings on licensed victuallers' premises was also forbidden by sec. 109 of the Licensing Act of 1885. It is also illegal under the Unlawful Assemblies and Processions Act of 1890, sec. 10.

[39] "M.P.," *History of Orangeism*, p. 109.

[40] May 31, 1897, p. 10.

not move even at the command of a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry.

The Tyler is the guardian spirit who keeps watch and ward outside the lodge door. On his induction into office he has to take the following "obligation": "I, A.B., do solemnly declare that I will be faithful to the duties of my office, and I will not admit any person into the lodge *without having first proved him to be in possession of the financial password*, or without sanction of the W.M. of this lodge." The "duties of Tylers" are thus laid down in the ritual now used in Victoria: "The duty devolves on the D.M. of seeing that the lodge is properly tyled, who when directed to do so by the W.M. shall address the Tyler thus: 'Worthy Tyler, what is your duty to this lodge?' To which the Tyler shall reply thus: 'To prevent the intrusion of improper persons into the lodge, to take the names *and passwords from brothers previous to admitting them*, and to obey the commands of the W.M. in the admission of brethren and candidates for membership of the lodge.'"[41]

STRANGE INITIATION CEREMONIES.

Incidents not infrequently come to light which serve to show that, in other respects also, the printed rules and the jealously guarded rituals of the Orange society by no means represent what takes place in the secret conventicles of the brethren. A ludicrous instance in point was furnished by a Victorian Orange clergyman, Rev. C. H. Hammer. Speaking at the anniversary of the "True Blue" lodge, No. 96, Portland, on the 14th of July, 1893, he is reported to have said that "he joined the institution in Tasmania, *and when he was initiated they gave him a ride on a billy-goat*, which he enjoyed very much. (Laughter). Since then he had made rapid strides, and now stood before them as Past Deputy Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Lodge of Victoria."[42]

A writer in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1896 (p. 226), tells how a candidate for Orangeism was shot dead at his initiation—a bullet from a revolver which was used in the ceremony having penetrated his brain. The British *Hansard* of 1895[43] gives an account of two other curious initiation ceremonies which are nowhere provided for in the Orange ritual, and which had a tragic ending for two aspirants for the Purple degree. A question asked by Mr. McCartan, M.P., in the House of Commons, elicited from Lord Advocate J. B. Balfour the following information: On the 27th of April, 1895, one Joseph

[41] See Ritual, Appendix B.
[42] *Portland Observer*, July 17, 1893.
[43] *Parl. Debates*, vol. xxxiii., 4th Session of 1895, p. 1051.

Rankine, of Airblies, was being initiated into the Purple degree, at the Motherwell Orange lodge. He was blindfolded, and tossed so violently in a blanket, or a net hammock, that his spine was broken or dislocated at the neck.[44] The Lord Advocate added: "*The witnesses refused to describe the ceremonies practised on the occasion, on the ground that it is against the rules of the society to do so.*" In reply to a further query, Lord Advocate Balfour told how, on the 7th of July, 1893, one David Blair, while being initiated into the Purple degree at an Orange hall in Belfast, was likewise blindfolded, and while in the act of mounting a table (or ladder) in this condition, fell backwards and was killed. A unique case, arising out of an Orange initiation ceremony, came up in 1896 before Judge Luce, at the District Court, Waltham, Massachusetts. The particulars are given in the New York *Freeman's Journal*, of September 5, 1896. Evidence was given on oath that Frank A. Preble, when being initiated into membership of an Orange lodge, was compelled to discard nearly all his clothing. He was then (like Rankine and Blair) blindfolded, obliged to repeat the Lord's Prayer on his knees, and to clamber over a lot of rough blocks. He was struck with whips, posed on a ladder, thrown off it, and tossed in a blanket (like Joseph Rankine at the Motherwell lodge). After this, he had to carry a large bag of stones around the lodge-room. The initiation ceremonies concluded by his being burned on the breast with a branding iron, the wounds from which were raw for some ten days afterwards. Preble sought legal satisfaction for the cruel treatment he had received, and Judge Luce fined six officers of the Orange lodge thirty-five dollars each. At a ruder period in the history of Orangeism (in 1820), the Irish rules were revised because (as stated in a resolution already quoted) practices had been adopted in the institution which were "offensive even to common decency." Blindfolding evidently and very appropriately forms a leading feature in the ceremony of initiation to the Orange or Purple degree. This, and the other ceremonies referred to above, are nowhere provided for in any of the *printed* rituals ever issued by the Orange society. In well-regulated families, children indulging in such rough and dangerous horse-play would be soundly thrashed and sent supperless to bed.

FURTHER PRECAUTIONS.

No new lodge can be opened in any place until the Grand Lodge is satisfied as to "the suitability of the place of

[44] The incident was reported at the time in the Belfast *Irish News*, the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, etc.

meeting."[45] This is the first inquiry which the Grand Secretary is directed to make when application is made for the formation of a new lodge. There was a time when "the usual place of meeting was the public-house."[46] This custom still prevails to a considerable extent in Ulster, and, though illegal, it has the sanction of the Grand Lodge of Victoria, but only when "a suitable room cannot be obtained elsewhere," and when due precautions are taken to keep the proceedings of the brethren safe from the eyes and ears of the profane.[47]

To this day, the "outside tyler" (who must be a Purple-man) is an indispensable officer of every Orange lodge. No meeting is "open" until he has taken his place *outside* the lodge door, to guard the brethren's secrets against prying eyes and eavesdropping ears. In addition to the "outside tyler," there is also (Rule 54) the "inner guard," also composed of Purple members. The Grand Lodge has its tried and true "Grand Tylers," who keep watch and ward during the deliberations of the supreme council, the inner circle, of the Orange institution.

From the rise of Orangeism to the present day, elaborate precautions have ever been taken to prevent rule-books, rituals, minutes of proceedings, and lodge documents generally, from falling into the hands of persons outside the society. The following are the chief methods which have been adopted to effect this purpose:

1. *Oaths, etc.*—The Rules of 1800 required the secretary and deputy secretary of every lodge to swear, "upon their appointment," "that I will, to the utmost of my power, keep safe the papers belonging to the lodge, and that I will not give any copy of the Secret Articles, or lend them to make an Orangeman out of the lodge I belong to," etc.[48] We have already seen, in the course of this chapter that, at the present day, the secretary makes the self-same promise, with religious ceremonies which "have the apparent obligation of an oath."

2. The rituals and records of the private lodges are held exclusively in the possession of Purple-men, who, as we have seen above, are not permitted to divulge the secrets of their degree to the brethren of the lower, or Orange, order. The records of the Grand Lodge are kept by the small inner circle of Purple-men who guide the destinies of the association. Their special secrets—oral and written—are jealously guarded,

[45] See rule 50 in Appendix C.

[46] Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 378.

[47] See Rule 17, Appendix C.

[48] Appendix to English Parl. Committee's *Report*; Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., after Introd.

not alone from members of the Orange degree, but even from the great body of Purple-men who are not entitled to sit within the mystic portals of the well-"tyled" Grand Lodge. The Grand Lodge is, in turn, the only authority[49] in the society which can permit a private lodge, or a lodge-member, to reveal or publish *any* Orange secret or document of whatsoever kind. Deputy Grand Secretary Swan revealed the annual password of the Irish society to the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835. He, however, produced a Grand Lodge warrant authorising him to do so, and declared that without it he could not have given even this trifling bit of information.[50] In this matter no discretion is left with the members of a private lodge, either singly or in council assembled, even when the document, etc., in question are neither of a private nor compromising character. The following is a case in point. It is taken from the proceedings of the Irish Grand Lodge, May 28 and 29, 1856:[51]

"*Resolved*—That Lodge 168 be at liberty *to publish an address of condolence* to Mrs. Maxwell."

A similar regulation is in force in the lodges of Victoria, as will appear by the rule quoted hereunder.

3. *Printing of Documents, etc.*—All rule-books, rituals, and documents relating to the working of the society at large, are printed by Orangemen only, and under the direction of the Grand Lodge. The Irish rules of 1800 bear on their title page the imprint: "DUBLIN: PRINTED BY AN ORANGEMAN."[52] The Victorian rules are printed by Brother C. W. Burford (1893). Rule 18 contains the following:

"All documents necessary to the working of the institution, including rule-books and rituals, warrants, certificates, and all other forms *shall be printed exclusively under the directions of the Grand Lodge; and no private lodge or member shall present to any person or body, or publish or print any address or other documents,*

[49] The Irish (revised) rules of 1849 require of the *ordinary* Orangeman (of the lower degree) the following "additional qualifications": "That he is one who will not *in any manner* communicate or reveal *any of the proceedings or counsels of his brother Orangemen in lodge assembled; or any matter or thing therein communicated to him, unless to a brother Orangeman, well knowing him to be such,* or until he shall have been authorised to do so by the proper authorities of the Orange institution." (*Report* of the Belfast Riots Royal Commission of 1857, Appendix 14, p. 275). In a footnote the Royal Commissioners say: "The proper authority is the Grand Lodge of Ireland; its permission to be given in writing, under its seal, and signed by the Grand Master and Grand Secretary, or Deputy Grand Secretary."

[50] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 1146-1148.

[51] Appendix 14 to *Report* of Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the Belfast Riots of 1857, p. 284. This Appendix contains the proceedings of the Irish Grand Lodge from 1855 to May, 1857.

[52] See copy of Rules in Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., after Introd

or be a party to any act which may in any way involve the institution, or any members thereof as such, without the sanction of the Grand Lodge. *Any member violating this rule shall be liable to expulsion.*"

COOKED PROSPECTUSES.

4. Another method to which the Orange society has resorted for the purpose of concealing the true character of its proceedings, is the distribution of specially prepared, or—as they would be termed on the Stock Exchange—"cooked," books of rules. In 1813, in consequence of the excessive violence of the Orange societies, large numbers of petitions were sent to the House of Commons, both by Protestants and Catholics, praying for their suppression. In June of that year Mr. William Wynne, a Protestant M.P., gave notice that he would direct the attention of the House to the existence of illegal societies of the kind. The debate on the subject opened on the 29th June, 1813. In the meantime, however, a new book of rules was distributed to members in the lobby. It differed from the one then in use in many important particulars. For instance, it altogether omitted the great feature of the Orangeism of the time—the illegal oath of conditional loyalty, which bound the brethren to support the king and his heirs only "so long as he and they shall support the Protestant ascendency."[53] Later on, under stress of the law (1821, 1828), these oaths were omitted from the *printed* rules, and a declaration against Transubstantiation substituted for it. This was likewise illegal. In 1834—at a time when the Orange question was occupying a good deal of the attention of the people and of Parliament—another pamphlet, professing to contain the rules of the Orange society, was again distributed among the members of both Houses. When compared with those actually in circulation among the Orange body, it was found that the illegal declaration against Transubstantiation had been omitted. The Dublin Grand Lodge had, by special resolution, ordered the circulation of the rule-books containing this declaration through all the lodges in Ireland. They endeavoured to get rid of the evidence of their act by erasing the order from one of the Grand Lodge books—leaving it, however, intact in another, which fell into the hands of the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835.[54] In like manner, the notorious ten Secret Articles of 1799 and 1800 were quietly dropped from the revised rules of 1828, but the records of the Grand Lodge, as submitted to the Parliamentary Committee

[53] *Parliamentary Debates*, quoted by "M.P.," *History of Orangeism*, p. 144
[54] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 2505, 2525 *sqq.*, and Append. 1st *Rep.* p. 29.

of 1835, contained no indication that they had ever been repealed. For all we know to the contrary, they may be in force in the lodges at the present day.[55] Reference has already been made to the large degree of liberty allowed to lodges, in the matter of making by-laws, by rule 68 of the Orange institution of Victoria (ed. 1893). The printed *general* rules issued by the Grand Lodge by no means represent, therefore, the full facts of the laws and usages of the private and district lodges. We have seen, in confirmation of this, how illegal oaths and tests, secret signs, and certain initiation ceremonies which are nowhere provided for in the printed rules and rituals, are retained to our day among the members of the Orange organisation.

MUTILATING AND CONCEALING DOCUMENTS.

5. The dismay of the Orange leaders at the prospect of lodge documents being dragged into the light of day was never more clearly manifested than during the great crisis of 1835, when the institution—which lay under the stigma of a treasonable conspiracy to alter the succession to the throne—was the subject of a protracted inquiry by Select Committees appointed by the British Parliament. Orange lodges had been held in England, under Irish warrants, before 1808. The English Select Committee complain that the proceedings of these lodges were not placed before them.[56] The Select Committees also failed to get possession of the early rules of the Orange association, which were admitted to be in the possession of Colonel Verner, one of the Irish leaders of the society.[57] Three leaves —rightly or wrongly supposed to refer to the Cumberland conspiracy—were missing from the minute-book of the Grand Lodge for February, 1834.[58] They have never since been

[55] Reference is made to "the articles" in the ritual now current in the lodges. The sixth of the "Secret Articles" ran as follows: "We are to appear in ten hour's warning, or whatever time is required (provided it be not hurtful to ourselves or families, and that we are served with a lawful summons from the Master), otherwise we are fined as the company think proper." The English Select Committee, in their *Report*, dwelt in strong terms on this plan of calling out, and concentrating on short notice, large bodies of armed men.

[56] *Report*, 3rd paragraph.

[57] See *Minutes of Evidence*, Col. Verner's (also Col. Blacker's) evidence. The rules of 1800 were a confirmation of the draft rules drawn up by a committee on November 20, 1799. Thomas Verner (Grand Master) was chairman of the committee. Certain earlier rules were largely followed, "except," say the committee, "where we had to encounter gross violations of language and grammar." These earlier rules were sought for by the Select Committee, but on one pretext or other were withheld. Qq. 178 *sqq*

[58] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Committee of 1835 (evidence of Messrs Ward, Swan, Blacker, and Verner).

accounted for. In the second paragraph of their *Report* the English Select Committee of the House of Commons say:

"Your Committee have also examined several of the books and papers belonging to the institution, but they regret that their inquiries have been much narrowed by Lieutenant-Colonel Fairman[59] withholding the Book of Correspondence since February, 1834, and also the numerous documents of the institution remaining in his possession." In examination before the English Select Parliamentary Committee, Fairman admitted that the letters in the Book of Correspondence were "principally" connected with the Orange institution.[60] On two different days he, however, positively refused to submit the book to the inspection of the Committee. His refusal was duly reported to the House of Commons. On the 19th of August, 1835, he was called before the Bar of the House and severely reprimanded. He still persisted in his refusal. It was thereupon moved "that the witness [Fairman] be called in and informed that it was the opinion of the House he is bound to produce the book which has been alluded to in his evidence." *The Orange party in the House opposed the motion.* The following day (August 20, 1835) the recalcitrant Deputy Grand Secretary was again called before the English Select Committee. Then ensued the following scene, which has ever been typical of Orange witnesses when questioned regarding the secrets of their order:

"The Committee have assembled, agreeable to the order of the House, to receive that book which you have been directed to bring, in order to their prosecuting their inquiries. Have you brought the book?" Fairman replied: "I shall endeavour to extort the approbation of the Committee, though I may incur their hatred. I have not brought the book."

"Have you brought the book with you? I have not.

"Do you intend to bring it? I should consider myself the veriest wretch on the face of the earth if I did.

"Do you intend to bring it, agreeable to the order of the House, or not? I cannot.

"Will you? I have already said that I will not, and must adhere to the resolution I have before expressed.

---

[59] He was Deputy Grand Secretary of the Imperial Grand Lodge, London. For a fuller account of him, see chap. xv., *infra*.

[60] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 1073. Fairman admitted also, that the book in question might show many documents in connection with army lodges; "it might also (he said) contain letters to Lord Kenyon [Deputy Grand Master] upon Orange business *interspersed here and there with references which he would not make known to the Committee.*" Many have supposed that these jealously guarded "references" regarded the Cumberland Plot. See chap. xv., *infra*.

"Will you or not? I have stated that I adhere to my former resolution.

"Will you produce the book—yes or no? No."

On the same day (August 20th, 1835) the English Committee again reported to the House of Commons Deputy Grand Secretary Fairman's refusal to produce the letter-book. The House ordered him to be committed to Newgate; but, before the sentence could be carried out, the gallant colonel *had absconded*.[61] The contents of the letter-book have ever since remained a mystery to all but the inner circle of conspirators who guided the destinies of Orangeism in the fateful year of 1835.

THE SECRET.

What is the secret which must at all hazards be safeguarded from Catholics, and from all Protestants who may be reasonably *suspected* of being well disposed to Catholics? which must be kept from the great bulk of Protestants? which may not be told to mere Orangemen? which can only be revealed to a select coterie of the ruling caste, the Purple-men? which must be protected by illegal oaths, tests, signs, and mock-religious rites? which defies the authority of courts of law, and snaps its fingers in the face of Parliament? There must be a proportion between the secret and the means taken to guard it. On philosophical grounds we cannot fall back on the supposition that large bodies of grown men, in various stations of life, and in different countries, have for a hundred years, from sheer boyish caprice, conspired to act as Orangemen have done. The Orange secret must then, be of grave moment. It is manifestly something which it is neither safe nor politic to openly avow. All the surrounding circumstances point to it as being of criminal nature, since men who boast of their undying loyalty prefer to break the law, to commit perjury, to defy courts of justice, and to flout the authority of Parliament, rather than reveal it.

It is an undoubted loss to the historian of the lodges, and, generally, to English-speaking people living under the British flag, that so many and such valuable Orange documents were not dragged into the light of day in 1835. They would undoubtedly have laid bare many of the secret aims and workings of that strange association, which are known only to the little inner ring of Purple-men who sit around the Grand Lodge table. There is, however, a vast body of facts which, taken in the mass, all too clearly indicate certain broad aims, tendencies, methods, and effects of the Orange association.

[61] Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 380.

The circumstances attending its rise, its methods of organisation, the documents which it has not succeeded in concealing from the public eye, its uniform policy down the whole course of its history—all proclaim that (whatever local or temporary purposes it may *also* have served), the Orange society has ever given these two objects the chiefest place in its thoughts:

1. The political ascendency of the Orange party;

2. The political and social degradation of Catholics—in other words, the revival and perpetuation of civil disabilities for members of the hated creed.

1. The first mentioned purpose is sought to be attained by the well-known Orange principle of physical force, and by the formation of a compact and highly plastic political body, pledged to secure place and power for the members of their own party, or their sympathisers, exclusively. With this I shall deal in the next chapter.

2. The attainment of the other chief purpose referred to above is sought for mainly in the following ways:

(*a*) Excluding Catholics (as far as lies in their power) from public life; from Parliament, from Municipal and other public bodies, from the Civil Service,[62] and (as in Belfast and Derry) from offices of honour and emolument in the gift of the municipality. To this we may add the Orange principle of exclusive dealing in private and commercial life.

(*b*) Inflaming the minds of the public against the Catholic body. This is the evident purpose of the coarse, violent, and often inflammatory attacks made in the Orange press and on the Orange platform against the whole Catholic body—clergy, laity, religious orders; of the systematic dissemination of shocking, not to say indecent, distortions of Catholic doctrines and practices; of the marked encouragement given (especially in later years) to a class of adventurers who were thereby enabled to reap a golden harvest out of sensational or prurient tales of Rome's supposed "abominations." In a later chapter I shall return to the utterances of the Orange press and platform.

[62] See chap. viii., *infra*, and Appendix A.

Chapter VII.

ORGANISATION OF THE ORANGE SOCIETY: THE RULING CASTE; THE SUBJECT CASTE; THE INNER CIRCLE AND ITS WAYS — THE GRAND LODGE "MAINTAINS ITS AUTHORITY"—HOW THE BRETHREN "MAKE THEIR INFLUENCE FELT": RULES FOR PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS—THE AUTOCRAT OF THE LODGES AND THE POLLING-BOOTH.

In the light of what has appeared in the last chapter, the reader will not expect to find in the printed rule-books, rituals, and circulars of the Orange organisation, a full and fair statement of the aims, methods, and proceedings of the select and narrow inner circle which controls the policy of the institution. Nevertheless, there is much in the two copies of *The Laws and Constitution of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria*,[1] now before me, which will give an insight into the organisation of this strange survival of the spirit of a day that is happily long gone by. The rules here referred to possess more than a merely local importance: they are in almost every respect similar to those in use in Orange lodges everywhere, large portions of them being almost *verbatim* transcripts of the *Laws and Ordinances of the Orange Institution of Ireland*, printed at Belfast in 1872. These, in turn, contain no substantial alterations on the Irish rules of 1869, 1849, 1845, 1828, 1824, 1814, and 1800. The general principles of organisation set forth in the *Rules and Constitution* of the Victorian lodges are, therefore, simply those which have long prevailed in every country in which the Orange society has gained a footing. The portions of the *Constitution* with which I am at present concerned may be summed up as follow:

1. "The Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria" consists of "private" lodges, the most recently opened of which was numbered, at the date of this writing, 169.[2] These are under the

[1] See chap. v., *note* 3, *supra*.

[2] For the purposes of Orange organisation the colony of Victoria is divided into the following seven districts, each of which is presided over by a Deputy Grand Master: (*a*) Melbourne and Metropolitan District: (*b*) Ballarat and Western District; (*c*) Castlemaine, Sandhurst, and

supreme control of the Grand Lodge,[3] which holds at least two meetings every year in Melbourne.[4]

2. The members of the society are divided into various "orders" or "degrees"—Orange, Royal Arch Purple, and the various rings of the Black Preceptory lodges.[5] The Orange and Purple members, with whom I am at present concerned, meet in the private lodges.

3. The members of the Orange, or lower, degree are elected by ballot in the private lodges. One black ball in seven excludes.[6] This rule has been in constant operation in the Orange society since, at least, the year 1800. The candidate must, moreover, be "proposed and seconded in open lodge at least one month previous to such ballot."

THE RULING CASTE.

4. The Purple members form the ruling caste of the private lodges. They are appointed after a probation of not less than six months, and then only by the consent of their lodge, and on a written application made to the Grand Lodge by the secretary of the private lodge. The Purple degree can be conferred only by a person authorised to do so by special certificate of the Grand Lodge, such certificate remaining "in force *for the current year only*."[7]

The following are among the privileges of Purple members:

(*a*) No new lodge can be founded without a written application to the Grand Lodge, signed by at least three Purplemen.[8]

(*b*) No lodge meeting can be held unless at least *three* Purplemen are present. These, with *two* brothers of the lower degree (Orange), form a quorum.[9]

(*c*) No candidate can be admitted to the Orange degree except by a Purple member, especially authorised by the Grand Lodge to confer that degree.[10]

(*d*) *Only those Purple members who are qualified by the Grand Lodge to confer the Orange degree are eligible to be officers of the private lodges.*[11] It will be thus seen that the Grand Lodge largely, or altogether, controls the officership, and thereby the policy, of the private lodges.

Northern District; (*d*) North-Eastern District; (*e*) Geelong and South Western District; (*f*) Gippsland District; (*g*) Wimmera District (Rule 33; cf. Rule 32).

[3] Rule 32. See Appendix C.

[4] Rule 36.

[5] Rule 67. This whole chapter should be read in connection with what appears on pp. 399-401.

[6] Rule 1.

[7] Rules 3, 16, 67.

[8] Rule 50.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Rule 54

[11] *Ibid.*

(*e*) The Purple officers of private lodges may (subject to the approval of the Grand Lodge) make such by-laws as they think fit, provided that such by-laws shall not be "inconsistent with the laws of the institution."[12]

(*f*) We have already seen from other sources that the Purple members hold the high secrets of the private lodges, which they are not permitted to divulge even to a brother of the Orange degree. During the deliberations, a reliable Purple "Tyler" stands outside to guard the door from prying eyes. There is also an "inner guard" of Purple officers.[13]

(*g*) Purple members alone are entitled to send delegates (one delegate for every 25 members) to the two meetings of the Grand Lodge, which take place every year in May and November.[14] Members of the Orange (or lower) degree are not represented at these meetings.

(*h*) The Grand Lodge (which rules the lodges of the colony and directs their policy) is elected from among the Purple and other delegates, etc., at the November meeting in each year.[15] Members of the Orange degree have no voice in the election of the Grand Lodge officers (the supreme council of the institution), and are rigidly excluded from the Grand Lodge meetings. Even Purple members who do not belong to the Grand Lodge are excluded, unless by express permission.[16] "Grand Tylers" keep watch and ward outside the Grand Lodge doors during the deliberations of the inner circle of the Orange organisation.

The Grand Lodge exercises practically complete control over both the membership and the policy of the Orange institution. It controls the membership in the following ways: (*a*) By warrant; (*b*) by appointment; (*c*) by veto; (*d*) by re-ballot; (*e*) by suspension, expulsion, etc.

(*a*) *Warrant.*—Rule 27 says: "No lodge shall be held without the authority of a warrant under the seal of the Grand Lodge of Victoria. Such warrants are the property of the Grand Lodge, and may at any time be suspended, cancelled, or withdrawn by the Grand Master or the Grand Lodge."

(*b*) *Appointment.*—We have seen (1) that the Grand Lodge holds exclusively in its hands the appointment of the members of the ruling caste of the private lodges. (2) It empowers a certain number of these to confer the Orange degree.[17] (3)

[12] Rule 68.
[13] Rule 54.
[14] Rules 32, 36.
[15] Rule 32.
[16] Rule 40.
[17] Rule 54.

Those so empowered are the only persons in the whole institution who are eligible to be officers of private lodges. Moreover (4), by rule 54, the Purple-men who are elected to be lodge officers *are not allowed to act as such, or to be installed, until their appointment has been "confirmed by the Grand Lodge."* This will enable the reader to judge of the unlimited and absolute control which the Grand Lodge exercises, by virtue of its power of appointment, over the *personnel* and the policy of the private lodges.

(*c*) *Veto.*—By rule 58, every lodge secretary is required to furnish the Grand Lodge annually with a list of "all persons who have resigned, been rejected, or expelled, with the reasons for such rejection, suspension, or expulsion."[18] This "black list" furnished by all the lodges is printed every year by the Grand Lodge, soon after the November meeting, and a copy sent to the secretary of every lodge in the colony.[19] The same practice is followed in every colony and country in which the Orange organisation is established. The object of this rule is to exclude from the society all but men of the "right sort." The following further regulations on the subject, from the Victorian *printed* ritual,[20] make this sufficiently clear:

(1). Every Orangeman, at his initiation, is, after various ceremonies, required to kneel, and, holding the Bible in his hands, to make (among others) the following solemn declaration: "I do solemnly and sincerely declare . . . that I have not, to my knowledge or belief, been proposed in and rejected by, nor suspended or expelled from, any other Orange lodge." (In the last chapter evidence has been adduced which goes to show that, at their initiation, candidates for the Orange society in Ulster, are, at least sometimes, formally *sworn*, as a matter "of course," on the New Testament).

(2). *Resigned members* are (by rule 9) not permitted to rejoin the society unless their application for re-admission is approved of *by the lodge from which they resigned*, and not even then without the special written *permission of the Grand Lodge.*

(3). *Rejected candidates* cannot "be re-balloted for in any lodge until *after the expiration of twelve months* from the date of such rejection, *and then only by the special permission of the Grand Lodge.* Any person who has been rejected by *one* lodge, and has obtained admission into *another* without informing the members of the fact, shall, on proof thereof, be expelled the institution."[21]

---

[18] Compare Rule 4.
[19] Rule 46.
[20] See Appendix B.
[21] This rule provides for the case in which rejected candidates might

We have already seen that the Grand Lodge has the power of veto in connection with admission to the Purple degree, and with the appointment of officers of private lodges.

(*d*) *Re-Balloting.*—Rule 8 is of a sweeping character. It runs as follows: "In order to guard the institution against the *possibility of improper persons* continuing members thereof, it shall be competent for the Grand Lodge, upon the application of a private lodge, *to order a re-ballot for any member or members thereof;* and, should it be deemed expedient that ALL *or any members of the Institution* should undergo a new ballot, a re-ballot shall be taken in such a manner as the Grand Lodge shall prescribe. *Any member being rejected can only be re-admitted* into the Institution *with the sanction of the Grand Lodge*, after notice to the lodge by which such member was rejected." In the Irish rules of 1849 the re-ballot was started with five members, who were themselves selected by ballot beforehand.[22]

A CLEAN SWEEP.

(*e*) *Suspension*—Rule 26 is about the most drastic of the printed Orange code. It enables the Grand Lodge, or even the Grand Master, to suspend, nay, to *suppress any* lodge, *or as many lodges* as they may "see fit." By rule 27 (already referred to) no lodge can be held without the authority of a warrant from the Grand Lodge. Rule 26 runs thus: "All warrants, seals, and rituals issued to lodges *are the property of the Grand Lodge, which has the power of cancelling, suspending, or withdrawing any warrant* AS IT MAY SEE FIT, and of again issuing the same *to any other lodge*; but on all such re-issues of warrants the charge shall be 10s. 6d.; and *the Grand Master shall have full power to suspend, take, or authorise possession to be taken of, any warrant*, subject to appeal to the Grand Lodge; and *every warrant, while so cancelled, suspended, or withdrawn, shall be wholly void and inoperative*; and every member who shall knowingly act upon, or sit under, any such warrant during such period, *shall be suspended* for a term not exceeding two years." The suspension or expulsion of a member *takes effect at once.*

Rule 5, although printed before, is a sequel to rule 8. *It has the effect of expelling or suspending from the society every member of a lodge the warrant of which has been cancelled or withdrawn.* The rule runs as follows:

"Any member of the institution, the warrant of whose lodge has been surrendered or cancelled, may, *with the consent of*

---

seek admission to other lodges previous to the publication of the annual "black list."

[22] The revised rules of 1849 are given in Appendix 14 to *Report* of Belfast Riots Commission of 1857, *q.v.* pp. 271-272.

the Grand Lodge, be received *as a rejoining member* by any other lodge, on payment of two shillings and sixpence, *a ballot to be taken for his admission*."

To realise the full extent of the authority vested in the separate Grand Lodges of each country or colony, the reader must bear in mind that their control over the membership and policy of the lodges under their several jurisdictions, is supreme, arbitrary, and irresponsible. Despite the existence of an "Imperial Grand Council," there has been, I think, no appeal from their decisions ever since the fateful day when the Imperial Grand Lodge of London—which had exercised control over the national and colonial Grand Lodges—was dissolved in 1836, in consequence of the damaging revelations which had been brought to light during the previous year by the Parliamentary Select Committees of Inquiry into the Orange system. The Grand Lodge is thus practically the final court of appeal on all subjects. It decides what is, and what is not, "consistent with the principles of the institution." It rewards and punishes, it makes and suppresses lodges "as it sees fit." It opens, and no man shuts; shuts, and no man opens.

In all this, the organisation of the Orange institution is in complete accord with that of other secret societies whose constitutions have been brought into the light of day. The whole object and effect of the Orange "laws and constitution" is to place the members, as far as possible, under the complete control of the Grand Lodge—to bind them to support the political programmes or other schemes of their leaders, under such penalties as fines, suspension, or expulsion. Anyone acquainted with the history and proceedings of secret societies need not be reminded that these punishments—and especially the last-mentioned—are but relatively light. What with the well-known Orange principle of exclusive dealing, and the system of harrying "Papist" Protestants, circumstances might frequently arise in which expulsion from the society might lead to a form of social ostracism, or to financial loss or ruin.

"GOOD MEN IN BAD TIMES."

A tract[23] which has a wide circulation among the lodges gives the following as a "further definition" of Orangeism: "It is a religious and *political* society." It justifies its being "a secret society" in this way (p. 3): "We need an organisation to ensure *united action and a vote on all important occasions*." In their *Report* to the House of Commons, the English Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 say: "The Orange lodges

[23] *Definition of Orangeism*, Bro. C. W. Burford, Printer, Melbourne.

have also interfered in various political subjects of the day, *and made Orangeism a means of supporting the views of a political party.*"[24] In his letter of July 5, 1834, to the Deputy Grand Secretary, Mr. Randel E. Plunket, M.P. (Deputy Grand Master of Ireland) states that the Orange body is capable of being rendered eminently "available at elections."[25] He also refers to the value of its physical force," and to "its peculiar and unique application to purposes of communication between persons of all grades, and to large bodies, whether the intent of such application be *for insuring an election etc.*"[26] The English Committee's *Report* continues: "Your Committee could not keep out of sight the incidents that took place in Ireland at that gentleman's [Mr. Plunket's] election, by the interference of large bodies of armed Orangemen, as detailed in the evidence on the table of the House." This form of lodge violence reached its climax in the old days of open voting—during the Emancipation and Reform agitations, in the course of which several elections were influenced by the intimidation and outrages of armed brethren. I need only instance the elections of Drogheda and Trim, in 1834.[27] The Irish Orange body steadily and violently opposed the Bills for Catholic Emancipation, National Education (Ireland), Reform, the Repeal of the Tithes Act, the Extension of the Franchise, Church Disestablishment, the Land Acts, and, generally, all legislation in the direction of equal justice to the Catholic body, or for the advancement of popular liberty.[28]

"FREE AND INDEPENDENT ELECTORS."

On the occasion of Municipal or Parliamentary elections,

[24]Cf. Deputy Grand Secretary's words to the Duke of Gordon, Grand Master for Scotland, August 11, 1833, chap. i., *supra*, p. 3.

[25]Quoted in *Report* of English Select Committee. This Mr. Plunket was also Grand Master of the county of Meath, and a member of the Imperial Grand Lodge of London. *Ibid.*

[26]*Ibid.* See note 27, *infra*.

[27]*Minutes of Evidence*, Select Parl. Committee, Qq. 6101, 6088, 6203, 6212, etc. Several hundred armed Orangemen marched into Trim *from the neighbouring counties*, on the election day. They were led by a clergyman Rev. Mr. Preston, who, according to the evidence, "held a pistol in his hand." On their return march, they killed a Catholic named Henry, at Kells. Mr. Plunket, M.P. (mentioned above), thanked them "for their services" on the occasion of the election.

[28]See Molesworth's *Hist. of England*, vol. i., pp. 378-379. In its issue of June 1, 1886 (p. 3) the *Victorian Standard* (the organ of the lodges of Victoria), quotes a speech of the noted Orangeman, Lord Rossmore, who was deprived of the Commission of the Peace for his extreme sectarian spirit. He said: "To Englishmen, then, I would say: *Disfranchise Ireland.*" See also Killen's *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 456; Wyse's *History of the Catholic Association*, Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*, pp. 111, 112, etc.

the Grand Lodge will recognise in no Orangemen the right to exercise the franchise otherwise than according to its dictation. "The Orange lodges," say the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835, "have also interfered with the elective franchise by expelling members of their body, as at Rochdale, in 1835, for voting for the Liberal candidate." Other instances of interference with voters are given in the same *Report*, and in the *Minutes of Evidence*. The venerable Mr. Christie, in his examination before the Select Committee of 1835, says:[29] "I have seen and known instances in which the Orangemen have been collected and stimulated to assemble and march in order to the church. I saw them go into one church to sign a petition against Catholic Emancipation, and the church was kept open, and they marched in procession, and I was myself in a gig with an Orangeman, who reprimanded them for so doing. He said they were *ordered in*, but not to go in a procession. They were *ordered in* by the District Masters, as I understand." Similar cases occurred in other parts of Ulster during the same period.[30]

In the *Minutes of Evidence* of the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, instances are given of clergymen and others having been punished by the lodges for entertaining liberal sentiments towards Catholics. In 1831, two Protestant clergymen were expelled from the society for having voted for the Reform candidate.[31] The following resolution of the Irish Grand Lodge is given at Question 1940 of the Parliamentary Select Committee's *Report:* "That it is the recommendation of this Grand Lodge that the lodges [in the Dublin district] do remove from any official situations which they may occupy, such persons, being freemen of the City of Dublin, or freeholders, who voted for the Reform candidates at the late election, *or who refrained from voting against them.*"

At its meetings of May 28 and 29, 1856, the same Grand Lodge drew up and imposed upon the brethren throughout the country a plan of operations for the coming Parliamentary elections. One of the resolutions ordered that the brethren "should *in all cases* vote for the support of those candidates who will oppose the Maynooth Grant and the endowment of Popery."[32] In its meetings of November 27 and 28 of the same

[29] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5691.

[30] The Belfast *News-Letter* of January 27, 1829, contains an address to the "Orangemen of Derry," giving details of similar meetings of brethren to sign anti-Emancipation petitions. Quoted by "M.P." p. 168, *note*.

[31] *Report* of Parl. Select Committee, *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 1939.

[32] Appendix 14 to *Report* of the Royal Commission on the Belfast Riots of 1857, p. 284.

year, the Irish Grand Lodge sent out petitions to be signed by the lodges, praying for the repeal of the Maynooth Grant.[33] In the minutes of their proceedings for May 27 and 28, 1857, I find the following:

"*Resolved unanimously*—That the Grand Lodge feel called upon to express their *strongest dissatisfaction* with the conduct of those Orangemen who, at the recent general election, voted and exercised their influence in favour of candidates who refused to pledge themselves" to oppose the endowment of Maynooth College. They recommend the lodge officers to make "strict inquiry" into the conduct of the offending members, "and report to this Grand Lodge at next meeting, in order that steps may be taken by this Grand Lodge *to maintain its authority over those who may, on such occasions, forget or violate their duties as Orangemen.*"[34]

The minutes of the Irish Grand Lodge, given in the Belfast Riots *Report* of 1857, contain even more extreme instances of the bullying and intimidation of Orange voters, in the interests of individual members of the ruling inner circle of Purple men. The proceedings of the meetings of November, 1857, give an idea of the extent to which the free exercise of the franchise is interfered with in the lodges. A large number of members were expelled "for voting at an election against a dignitary of the institution." The records of the fourth day of this Grand Lodge meeting (November 6th, 1857, Deputy Grand Master Waller in the chair) contain a list of some fifty members belonging to Derry county, who were "expelled for voting against their Grand Master, Sir R. H. Bruce, Bart., at the late Parliamentary elections." Some fifty others in the same county were suspended for seven years "for using their influence against their Grand Master at the elections." This was in the good old days of open voting, when such intimidation was comparatively easy. The reader will now see how the supreme guides of Orange policy have adapted their

---

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 290, 291. By the Act of 1845 (8th and 9th Vic., chap. xxv.) the Grant to the Catholic College, Maynooth, for the training of Irish priests, was, amidst a great outcry from the lodges, raised to £26,000 a year. This was the only "endowment of Popery" in Ireland of which the English Government had been guilty. In 1868, the revenue of the Established Church amounted to £616,840 (*Irish Church Directory* for 1833, p. 145). In the same year the *Regium Donum* given to the Presbyterians and Unitarians amounted to about £40,000 (Killen's *Eccles. Hist.* ii., 587o, The lodges made no objections to the endowment of the Protestant Churches. On the contrary, they, in 1868 and 1869, openly threatened armed rebellion if the Queen would sign the Bill for disestablishing the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland.

[34] Appendix 14 to *Report* of Royal Commission on the Belfast Riots of 1857, p. 294.

electioneering methods to meet the new set of conditions created by the Ballot Act.

On the 12th of July, 1891, the "Grand Master, Loyal Orange Institution of England," issued an address[35] to the brethren of his jurisdiction. In the course of this manifesto he broadly indicated the "strict course of action" which was to be adopted by English Orangemen "individually and collectively." "In party politics," said he, "you are to be guided by the instructions which from time to time may be given you from me, through your provincial or district officers; in no case taking any party side until the *fiat* has gone forth from myself, indicating the course you are to take."

TIED TO THE CHARIOT WHEELS.

Four principal methods are adopted by the members of the Grand Lodge to mould the policy of the Orange body into subservience to their political views or aspirations. These will be sufficiently exemplified by the rules adopted in the lodges of Victoria, which are a sufficiently faithful reflex of those in force in every country where the Orange society is established. These methods are as follow:

1. By directing the business-sheet, etc., of the lodges at any time. The following dictatorial rule is No. 25 of the 1885 edition: "Every private lodge shall hold a special meeting when requested by the Grand Lodge by order under seal, *and shall consider such business* as may be directed by such order."[36]

2. By largely or altogether controlling the vote of the private lodges on the matters which they are required to discuss. Rule 51 of the Victorian lodges (ed. 1893) runs as follows:

"All elective officers of the Grand Lodge are *ex officio members of all private lodges, and are entitled to preside therein*[37] *and vote on all subjects* save and except the distribution of funds, the election of officers, and the formation of by-laws." It is thus in the power of the Grand Lodge to send to any private lodge a sufficient number of its members to outvote the lodge officers on any question of party policy that may arise. The members of the lodge are bound to accept a majority vote secured even in this way.[38]

3. Another and ever-ready expedient by which the Grand Lodge, or even the Grand Master, can compel submission to

---

[35] This address appeared at the time in full, in the Belfast *Weekly News*, from which these extracts are taken.

[36] See Rule 30, ed. 1893, in Appendix C.

[37] The Purple man who presides at an Orange meeting has a deliberative vote and a casting vote.

[38] *Rules of Order*, No. 26, Victorian ed., 1893.

the order of the inner circle, is the infliction of the punishments referred to above: Suspension or expulsion of recalcitrant members, and suspension or complete suppression of the stubborn lodge. The last-mentioned penalty is equivalent, as I have shown above, to the expulsion of all the members of the particular lodge affected by it.

4. It is, however, in Parliamentary and Municipal elections that the lodge members—Orange and Purple—are bound hand and foot to the political schemes, and the personal likes, dislikes, and ambitions of the Grand Master, as they were in the days when they were driven, as unresisting as flocks of sheep, to sign petitions against the Emancipation of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. The extracts given above from Grand Lodge records sufficiently indicate the fact that the free exercise of the franchise by members is visited with the extremest penalties which it is in the power of the Orange society to inflict. It is not, however, so generally known that candidates are admitted into the society on the express condition that they must not, on any account, vote for a Catholic, either at Parliamentary or Municipal elections, and that their votes and influence are to be at all times placed blindly and unconditionally at the beck and call of the Grand Master or the officers of the Grand Lodge. According to the *printed* initiation ceremony now in use, the "Worshipful Master" thus addresses the candidate for the Orange degree:

"Friend, . . . *it is also required of you* that, should you now, or at any future period, be in the possession of the election franchise, *you will support by your vote and interest Orange and Protestant candidates* ONLY, *and in no wise refrain from voting*, remembering our mottoes: 'Measures, not men,' and 'He who is not with us is against us.' *Your neglecting to fulfil these conditions will render you liable to expulsion.*"[39]

But this is not all. "Abyss calleth to abyss." According to the *printed* ritual now (nominally, at least) in use, promises of a still more far-reaching character are exacted from the candidate for the Orange (or lower) degree. Kneeling before the assembled lodge, and holding the Bible in his hands, he makes a solemn declaration, having (says the English *Report*) "the apparent obligation of an oath" (or, not improbably, as we have seen in the sixth chapter, he takes a formal oath) to "*abide by* ALL *rules made for the government of the Orange Institution* in Victoria."[40] By this sweeping "obligation" he delivers over his will to blindly obey the unknown orders of the irresponsible

[39] See Ritual in Appendix B.
[40] *Ibid.*

ring of secret conclavists who locally guide the destinies of the Orange organisation.

The writer of these pages has in his possession an elaborate summons issued to a certain "brother" (a policeman) by the King William Lodge, No. 92 (Melbourne), and dated March 17, 1892. The "brother" in question is required to attend, on the 21st, a "summons meeting." The third item on the business-sheet of the meeting is thus stated: "To consider matters in connection with the forthcoming General Election." During the Australian Federal Convention campaign of 1897, an organ of the Orange lodges, the *Victorian Standard*, of February 27, published a list of candidates, which was headed by the names of the "Most Worshipful Grand Master" of the colony, the Hon. Simon Fraser, Deputy Grand Master R. T. Vale, and another member of the fraternity. A printed slip, containing the same list of names, was also circulated among the lodges. From the same issue of the *Victorian Standard* (p. 12) I learn that an active canvass of the Melbourne and suburban lodges was made, previous to the Federal elections, by the Grand Master, Mr. Vale, and other officers of the Grand Lodge. "A course of action was decided on," and every brother was called upon in an editorial to "register his vote on the 4th [of March, 1897] according to the dictates of his conscience and the laws of the Orange institution." There is an air of guileless innocence and sweet simplicity about this appeal, which conveys to the casual reader no idea of the Draconian methods by which electioneering matters are "considered" and "decided on" within the guarded portals of the Orange lodge. The following "Rules for Elections" are not merely a literary curiosity. They are substantially carried out in every place where a lodge is established, and thus afford an instructive insight into the searching form of political slavery which exists, even in Ballot Act days, under the fair professions of the Orange organisation. These election rules are given word for word as they appear on p. 18 of the *Laws and Constitution of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria*, which were printed by Cross and Co., Daylesford, Victoria, in 1885. They will indicate the means adopted by the Grand Lodge "to secure [as a favourite Orange tract, already quoted, states] united action and a vote on all important occasions,"[41] or (to use the words of the Grand Master at the opening of the Melbourne Protestant Hall) "to make their influence felt on the public affairs of the colony."[42]

[41] *Definition of Orangeism.*
[42] *Argus* Report, November 11, 1882.

"RULES FOR ELECTIONS:

"MUNICIPAL AND PARLIAMENTARY.[43]

"1. Lodges and individual members *are not to pledge themselves to any party or candidate until the Institution has decided.*

"2. The names of all *candidates desiring the vote of the Institution*, or of any candidate the brethren may think worthy of the vote, shall be forwarded to the *Grand Master*, or, in his absence, to the Grand Committee, who shall make inquiries as to their fitness, and the probabilities of their success, and *shall obtain from them pledges as to their conduct on questions affecting the welfare of the Institution, and the object of its existence.* He shall then forward the result of his inquiries, *with his recommendations*, to the different lodges in the electoral districts interested.

"3. With his recommendations shall be sent a *list of all the names of candidates that have been submitted to the Grand Master, in the order of preference.* If the lodges concur with his recommendations, energetic steps must be taken at once to give effect to them. Should the lodges, however, not concur, the Master shall at once proceed by ballot or show of hands to determine which of the candidates *on the list* shall have the vote.[44]

"4. Where there is more than one lodge in any town or locality, *the Grand Master* shall cause a joint meeting of the lodges to be summoned, when *his recommendations* shall be considered, and, if not concurred with, a vote shall be taken by ballot or show of hands, as hereinbefore provided. In each case a majority of votes to determine the issue.

"5. *The vote so taken to be binding on all members of the Order.* Should, however, any individual member have a conscientious objection to vote for any candidate so accepted by the brethren, *and who shall have stated his objection in the lodge previous to the*

---

[43]The italics and capitals, which do not occur in the original, are inserted for the purpose of directing the reader's attention to the more flagrant points of these rules. The election rules, being of a compromising nature, were quietly omitted from the edition of 1893. They are, however, still in force in the lodges. In the previous chapter we have seen that it is part of the settled policy of the Grand Lodges to excise, without repealing, oaths, tests, secret signs, and *printed* Orange rules that have become illegal, or that, when known to the public, would involve an exposure of its methods, or create a feeling against the institution. The by-laws of the private lodges (Rule 68) afford a convenient receptacle for rules, customs, etc., which it would not be prudent to commit to the relative risk of print.

[44]The list referred to here is that submitted by the Grand Master to the lodges. (See first two sentences of this rule). The lodges are thus absolutely precluded by these Rules from going outside the list of candidates furnished them by the Grand Master. The same is provided for in the next following Rule.

taking of the vote,[45] the decision shall not be binding on him, *nevertheless, the vote shall bind such member* NOT *to vote at any election against the Order, nor against any candidate supported by it.*

"6. *No objection on personal grounds will justify any brother in so withholding his vote.* Should the grounds of such objection be questioned, the case *shall be referred to the Grand Master, whose decision* SHALL *be accepted.*

"7. *The claims of candidates who are members of the Order* shall be considered first.

"8. The decision arrived at, and the action determined on, to be carried out with the *secrecy* necessary to ensure success.

"9. Copies of all letters written, or recommendations made, affecting any public man by which the Order is pledged, *implicated*, or interested, shall be kept, and *no politician outside the Order* shall, by letter or recommendation, secure the influence of the Order for his own political advancement, *until it has been sanctioned officially.*"

ONE REASON WHY.

Such are the methods by which the voting power of the Orange lodges is brought to bear on Municipal and Parliamentary elections. Orange candidates—without reference to fitness—must not alone get a preference, but the brethren are not permitted to extend their support to any respectable Protestant "politician outside the order" without the special sanction of the autocrat of the lodges, the Grand Master. Reference to the Orange *Ritual* in Appendix B will show that voting for a Catholic candidate is visited with prompt expulsion from the Orange society. Lodge schemes are thus made paramount to the interests of the country at large. The whole voting power of the brethren is handed over bodily to

---

[45] The reader will note, perhaps with some amazement, the force of this and the following rule. Briefly, they amount to this:

(*a*) "Conscientious objections" to the lodge candidate hold good *only when declared in the meeting before the vote is taken.*

(*b*) Even when the "conscientious objection" has been so stated, the scrupulous Orangeman is *bound* to give the lodge candidate a *negative* support by *not voting against him.*

(*c*) When the "conscientious objection" to the lodge candidate *arises* or *is stated after the vote of the lodge has been taken*, the "conscientious" Orangeman is, by force of this rule, *bound* to vote for the lodge candidate, *even against his (the voter's) conscience.* The voter whose scruples arise too late must learn to swallow them. He is not even privileged, like the other, to abstain from voting.

(*d*) The next following rule (6) practically nullifies the saving clause mentioned under (*a*) and (*b*) of this note. If the Orange voter's (personal) grounds of objection against the lodge candidate are "questioned" (as they are sure to be by *somebody*), the matter is "referred to the Grand Master, *whose decision shall be accepted.*"

the irresponsible and arbitrary control of the Grand Master for the time being, and made subservient to his personal schemes and ambitions. The reader can now form a shrewd guess as to why certain politicians fly the Orange flag.

The well known American *raconteur*, Mr. Chauncey Depew, is, I believe, responsible for the following story, which will serve to illustrate my point:

The teacher of a country school in the United States found one morning a woodchuck which had been shot and lost by a passing sportsman. He offered the bird as a prize to the boy who could give the best reasons for his political opinions. After a pause for reflection the first boy stood up.

"I am a Republican."

"Why are you a Republican?"

"Because Abraham Lincoln was one, and he freed the slaves."

"Next boy. What are you?"

"Sir, I am a Prohibitionist."

"Why?"

"Because the insane asylums are filled with the victims of strong drink. Because it makes widows and orphans and criminals."

"That will do. Next boy stand up. What are your politics?"

"I am a Democrat."

"Why are you a Democrat?"

"*Because I want the woodchuck.*"

The whole conduct of L.O.L. politicians, the position which they occupy on the Grand Lodge, the manner in which that position is habitually, and by virtue of the rules of the society, used for their personal benefit at election times, all lay them open to the not unreasonable suspicion that they adopt the Orange platform for the sake of the woodchuck – in other words, for the ever-organised, ever-ready, ever-obedient vote of the brethren in the day of need.

After recounting, in their *Report* to the House of Commons, the many disastrous results of Orangeism, the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 say: "All these evils have been proved by the evidence before the House in regard to Ireland, where the system has long existed on an extended scale, rendered more prejudicial to the best interests of society by the patronage and protection of so many wealthy members, *high in office and in rank, taking an active part in the proceedings* of these lodges."[46] The same *Report* says, a few paragraphs before:

[46] Since the collapse of 1835 comparatively few of what are termed the upper classes in society have joined the Orange institution. In the

"In the printed proceedings of the Grand Lodge, 4th June, 1833, the Duke of Cumberland [Imperial Grand Master] is reported to have stated that 'if the Grand Lodge have not confidence in the Grand Master, it is better, perhaps, that I should know it; but if it have confidence, its members must be aware that it is my wish to simplify the proceedings of the institution as much as possible. *Individual opinion* [these are the Duke's words] *is not to be consulted upon vital and important arrangements*, involving the welfare and best interests of the institution.'" Here the Grand Master dictates, not merely to the private lodges, but to the Grand Lodge as well.

A PUBLIC DANGER.

"It must always be kept in mind," continues the same *Report*, "that the power of calling out the members of all the Orange lodges in Ireland rests with the Grand Master and his Deputy, on the application of twelve members of the committee; that the same person is Grand Master of Great Britain and of Ireland, having the same powers, which are stated to be uncontrollable and arbitrary, of bringing together large bodies of armed and unarmed men, to make a demonstration of physical force which might prove highly dangerous."[47]

Such a power is apparently as consistent with the *Laws and Constitution of the Loyal Orange Institution of Victoria*, as it was with those of the Irish or English Grand Lodge in 1835. The English Select Parliamentary Committee say farther down in their *Report*, that when they "consider the possible use that might be made of such an organised power, *its suppression becomes, in their* [the Committee's] *opinion, imperatively necessary.*" A similar warning was raised in the House of Commons as far back as June 29, 1813, by Mr. Wynne, a Protestant M.P. He said that the Orange institution "is capable of being diverted to the worst purposes." A similar admission was made by Mr. Stewart Blacker, Assistant Grand Secretary of the Irish Grand Lodge, in reply to the following question put to him by the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835: "Would a body of *Roman Catholics, united together in a similar manner as the Orange body is*, be, in your opinion, dangerous to the State?" Stewart Blacker frankly answered: "I think a Catholic body, organised as the Orange institution is, *would be highly injurious and detrimental* to a Protestant country, as this,

---

Australian colonies the leaders of the society belong principally, if not altogether, to a certain class of politicians who are keenly alive to the value of the voting powers of the lodges at election times.

[47] See also Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth's *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 383, and chap. xv., *infra*.

by the blessing of God, still is."[48] It is a bad principle that does not work both ways. Here we find the Orange system of organisation condemned by the mouth of one of its acknowledged leaders.[49]

[48] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 2138.

[49] Cf. quotation from the Orange historian, Musgrave, in chap. xi., *infra*, near end.

Chapter VIII.

ORANGE DEMONSTRATIONS: FINE PHRASES APPRAISED—THE ORATORICAL CARNIVAL: A FEW WHIFFS FROM BILLINGSGATE—THE SECRET OUT: CATHOLICS AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE—THE SCARLET WOMAN AND THE GRAND OLD ENEMY—CAIN AND ABEL AND THE PEOPLE WHO WEAR HORNS.

The veiled prophet of Khorassan[1] lived a double part. In public, before the prostrate crowd, he was the tall, kingly form, who spoke as a god, and veiled the majesty of his features from the gaze of the vulgar eye. In the secret of his chamber, when the friendly veil was cast aside, he was the deformed Mokanna, whose soul was as black as his face was hideous.

Secret societies may be termed the Mokannas of our day. Before the world they, as a rule, veil their inner guilt under a fair disguise of fine professions. These usually take the shape of watchwords or mottoes. The motto of the Reds of 1789 was: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (or Brotherhood)." It was, unhappily, no mere play of words, but a melancholy truth which gave to these words the following interpretation: —"*Liberté—de mal faire; Egalité—de misère; Fraternité—comme Cain avec son frère.*" It was Liberty to do evil; Equality in the wretchedness which evil produces; Brotherhood, such as Cain showed towards Abel. The motto of the Anarchist-Socialist (according to M. Hamon)[2] may be reduced to the triple one: "Love of liberty," "love of justice," "love of others." Your Anarchist may blow up unoffending people, at Paris and Barcelona, with picrine shells and infernal machines; but none the less he poses before the world as an ethereal being, with a nimbus round his head, and his heart overflowing with emotions of the most expansive philanthropy.

The Orange society differs materially from Anarchism and Red Republicanism in both its aims and methods. It resembles them in the disguise of fair professions which it

[1] Moore's Poems: *The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan.*
[2] *Psychologie de l'Anarchiste-Socialiste.* Paris: 1896.

assumes. These professions were (after the manner of those of the *Sansculottes*) reduced by Mr. Gwynne, an agent of the Irish Grand Lodge, to a triple motto: "Protestantism, Loyalty, Organisation."[3] The professed objects of the association are more definitely stated by Grand Chaplain Rev. H. Heathershaw, at an Orange demonstration at Kew (Victoria). "The supreme object of Orangeism," said Mr. Heathershaw, "may be summed up in very few words: The glory of God and the welfare of man, the honour of the Sovereign and the good of the country."[4] These words are but a repetition of a favourite portion of what may be termed the official text of the sign-board of the lodges. The full text is contained in the following extracts, which are placed before the public on all possible occasions, and serve as a sort of preface to the rule-books of the society:

"Basis of the Institution.—The Orange Institution, so named in honour of King William, Prince of Orange, is composed of Protestants resolved to support and defend to the utmost of their power *the Protestant religion*, the *laws of the colony*, the *rightful Sovereign, being Protestant;* and to maintain the connection of this colony with Great Britain and Ireland. It is exclusively an association of those who are attached to the religion of the Reformation, and *will not admit into its Brotherhood persons whom an intolerant spirit leads to persecute, injure, or upbraid any man on account of his religious opinions.*

"General Qualifications.—The Master and Members of any lodge in which a candidate is proposed *must* satisfy themselves *previous to his admission*, that he possesses the following qualifications:

"An Orangeman should have a sincere love and veneration for the Triune God—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; an humble and steadfast faith in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, believing him to be God and man, and the only mediator between God and man. He should cultivate *truth and justice, brotherly kindness, charity*, devotion, piety, concord, unity, and obedience to the laws; *his deportment should be gentle, compassionate, kind, and courteous;* he should cultivate the society of the virtuous, and avoid the company of the evil; he should honour and diligently read the Holy Scriptures, and make them the rule of his faith and practice; he should love, uphold, and defend the Protestant religion, and sincerely desire and endeavour to propagate its doctrines and precepts; he should

[3] Mr. Gwynne, at his own request, gave evidence on behalf of the Orange society before the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast Riots, 1857. See their *Report*.

[4] *Victorian Standard*, August 31, 1896, p. 6.

strenuously oppose the fatal errors and doctrines of the Church of Rome, and scrupulously avoid countenancing, by his presence or otherwise, any act or ceremony of Roman Catholic worship;[5] he should, by all lawful means, resist the ascendency of that Church, its encroachments, and the extension of its power, *ever abstaining from all uncharitable words, actions, or sentiments towards its adherents*;[6] he should remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day, and attend the public worship of God; and diligently train up his offspring and all under his control in the fear of God, and in the Protestant faith; he should never take the name of God in vain, but abstain from all profane language, and use every opportunity of discouraging these and all other sinful practices in others. His conduct should be guided by wisdom and prudence, and marked by honesty, temperance, and sobriety. *The glory of God, the welfare of man, the honour of his Sovereign, and the good of his country should be the motives of his actions.*"

ALL THAT GLITTERS

The extracts just given *are the only portion of the Orange rule books which are published to the world.* The remainder is jealously guarded, as we have seen, by elaborate precautions, and severe penalties, from the eyes of the day-lit world that lies outside the lodges. The "basis" and the "qualifications" serve, in a manner, (*a*) to conceal the real aims of the institution; (*b*) to impress the public with a sense of the loyalty, piety, etc., of the organisation, and thus to attract new members, and conciliate the sympathy, and, on occasion, the active support, of Protestants who do not feel called upon to make formal profession of the peculiar theory of Christianity which is held in the lodges. (*c*) The "basis" and "qualifications" serve a still further purpose: On every occasion on which it becomes necessary to defend the character or proceedings of the Orange society, they are triumphantly advanced as a self-contained and "complete reply" to every charge which might be urged against it.[7] But it should be pointed out that:

[5] The minutes of the Irish Grand Lodge for November 28th and 29th, 1855, confirm the expulsion of an Orangemen from the society "for attending Mass." Appendix 14 to *Report* of Belfast Riots Commission of 1857. The italics in the questions given above are mine.

[6] "Our Roman Catholic *brethren*" are the words given in certain other versions of the "qualifications."

[7] For instance, Grand Master Hon. Simon Fraser, M.L.C. (Victoria) terms the "qualifications" "a complete reply" to strictures made against the society (*Ararat Advertiser*, July 7, 1896). Many other instances in point will be found in the Orange organ, the *Victorian Standard*, especially in the July and August numbers of each year, which are mainly devoted to reports of the annual demonstrations. See, for instance, the issue for June 30, 1897.

1. These "qualifications," etc., prove nothing, except that the assertions contained in them are made and published. They are not axiomatic statements, and do not contain the evidence of their own truth.

2. Parliamentary Committees, Royal Commissions, Protestant statesmen, judges, historians, etc., who are best acquainted with the history of Orangeism have, with practical unanimity, condemned these professions of piety and loyalty as misleading.

3. The century-old contrast between the official professions and the official practices of the Orange body furnishes the most cogent grounds for assuming that these professions serve to cloak designs which the leaders of the association find it inconvenient to openly avow.

IS NOT GOLD.

Lord Gosford, a Protestant, who for forty years had witnessed the proceedings of the Orange society in Armagh and Tyrone,[8] said, in his examination before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835: "There was no doubt of the fact, if what he had seen of the rules of the society was correct, he could say that *their practices differed greatly from their rules in* several instances, and that *their conduct had been diametrically opposed to those rules* in many instances."[9] This was the opinion of most of the witnesses examined by the same Committee. Lord Gosford said later on that in the "qualifications," etc., of the Orangemen, "there appears a great deal which is good Christian charity; but they are not always adhered to in practice."[10] The opinion of the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, formed after long and exhaustive inquiry, was expressed in the following terms in their *Report:*

"If the objects of the Orange lodges were to be judged by the moral qualification required by any person before he can be admitted a member, there would be little objection to them. [The 'qualifications' are here given.] But your Committee are of opinion that *the character and proceedings of the Orange society ought not to be tried by a mere reference to their professions*, inasmuch as *the conduct of that society, and the results which have ensued from their measures, are at variance with the* OSTENSIBLE *objects held out by their rules and ordinances.*"[11] Sir Frederick Stoven, Inspector-General of Constabulary, and a Protestant, deposed before the Parliamentary Committee of

[8] He was son of the Earl of Gosford, whose speech on the early Orange outrages is given in chap. iv., *supra*, pp. 72-73.

[9] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 3546. Cf. Qq. 3713, 3945, 3961, 4000, 4519, 4630.

[10] *Ibid.*, Q. 3938.

[11] *Report* of Select Committee (English) on Orange lodges.

1835, that the conduct of Orangemen was "the reverse of their professions."[12]

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the great Belfast riots of 1857 confirmed the opinion formed by the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, and proved that in the meantime Orangeism had not changed its spots, "In practice," said the Commissioners' *Report*, "it [the Orange Society] is not as in the letter of its constitution."[13] A practically similar verdict was reached by the other Royal Commissioners who were appointed to inquire into the scenes of sectarian riot, plunder, bloodshed, and loss of life, which drew the eyes of the astonished British world on the two great centres of Orange life and activity, Belfast and Derry, in 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886.

The *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1836, has the following, in an article based on the evidence laid before the Parliamentary Committee of the previous year; "Never did any society exhibit such a *glaring inconsistency*, rather such a *positive contradiction between its professed principles and its actual practice*. The practice of the society was to resort to every contrivance to insult, to domineer over, to offend, to irritate their Roman Catholic neighbours." The "basis of the institution," quoted above, declares that they will not admit anyone to membership who would "upbraid any man on account of his religious opinions." "That is ridiculous," said an Ulster Protestant magistrate, Mr. James Sinclair, D.L., before the Irish Select Committee of 1835.[14]

An English Protestant writer of some note, Rev. William Nassau Molesworth, deals as follows with the pious professions of the Orange association: "Nothing, apparently, could be more unobjectionable than the rules of this vast organisation. They breathed a spirit of moderation and toleration that was quite edifying. The members of the association were required to swear to 'defend the king and his heirs *so long as they support the Protestant ascendency*.' The objects of the association are stated to be 'exclusively Protestant, but at the same time most tolerant in spirit,' An Orangeman's qualifications are 'faith, piety, courtesy, and compassion.' He must be 'sober, honest, wise, and prudent.' He must love rational society, 'and hate swearing.' Such was the ideal Orangeman, as portrayed by the founders of the institution. But the actual living Orangeman was a widely different creature. The usual place of meeting was the public-house, where political prayers were

[12] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 4628, 4630.
[13] *Report*, pp. 10, 11.
[14] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 4973.

offered up, and various religious ceremonies gone through, in a manner that the habits, education, and feelings of the majority of the members of these societies will enable the reader to imagine." The same writer goes on to describe the "stupid bigotry" of "these mischievious marplots;" their fanatical hatred of, and senseless insults to, Catholics, the fury with which they opposed "every attempt made by English statesmen to apply to Ireland the most elementary principles of civil and religious liberty;" and "the great national scale" of the evils produced by their pernicious association.[15]

It would be easy to multiply expressions of opinions such as those here given, but enough has been said to throw the most serious *à priori* doubts on the truth and sincerity of the professions which the leaders of the Orange society from time to time plead as a set-off to the ugly array of serious crimes and misdemeanours of which the Orange society has been found guilty by such competent tribunals as Royal Commissions and Select Parliamentary Committees of Inquiry. Such appeals to the "qualifications of an Orangeman" must be regarded rather as an effort to catch the crowd, than to convince people who read and reason. The course of this chapter will show that the language habitually used at such demonstrations furnishes by itself alone conclusive evidence that Orangemen themselves do not take their "qualifications" seriously.

DEMONSTRATIONS.

The typical twelfth of July Orange demonstration,[16] as contemplated by the society, and carried out in Ulster, consists of two leading features:

1. The oratorical display, consisting of sermons, speeches, toasts, etc.

2. What may be termed the theatrical display, which consists mainly of public processions, with the use of party emblems and colours, party tunes and cries, etc. In the course of the next two chapters abundant reference will be made to

[15] *Hist. of England*, vol. i., pp. 378-379.

[16] The Orange rule books, etc., term the twelfth of July "the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne." The battle was fought, not on the 12th, but on the 1st of July, 1690. Any celebrations of the event that may have taken place must have been held on the 1st of July, until 1752, the year in which England tardily adopted Pope Gregory XIII.'s reformed Julian calendar. According to the Gregorian calendar, 12th July, new style, corresponds with 1st July, old style. In selecting 12th July for their anniversary, Orangemen are paying a perhaps unconscious tribute to the memory of a great and good Pope, whom their orators would denounce as the Man of Sin. Compare Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., chap. viii., p. 427, and *note*.

the methods and the results of this chief feature in the celebration of Orange anniversaries.[17]

The oratorical display of Australian Orangeism sufficiently exhibits:

(*a*) The violent contrast that exists between the official professions and the official practices of the lodges; and

(*b*) The general spirit and drift of the institution.

The oratorical display is, practically in every instance, so conducted as to be to the last degree offensive to the most cherished beliefs and sentiments of Catholics. And this it is plainly intended to be. I purpose dealing with this feature of the annual July carnival by itself alone, and apart from the historic associations which, as the reader will see in the course of the next chapter, form a chief ground of irritation to a large and peaceable section of the community.

In the eighteenth chapter of his *Vanity Fair*, Thackeray says: "One of the great conditions of anger and hatred is, that you must tell and believe lies against the hated object, in order to be consistent." This caustic remark of the great satirist finds a telling illustration in the sermons and speeches which are delivered from the Orange pulpit and platform each succeeding July, and which generally find their way to a wider public through the columns of the country press. The staple of these discourses consists of:

I. Attacks, frequently of great virulence, on the Catholic Church. Her doctrines and practices are every year seriously misrepresented and held up to ridicule, contempt, and hatred.

II. Attacks on the Catholic body. The Catholic population are set forth *in globo*, as being, by reason of their religion, untrustworthy, rebellious, disloyal, bloodthirsty, and, generally, highly undesirable citizens. Large classes of them—and especially the parochial clergy and the religious orders of men and women—are charged with the habitual commission of crimes of the gravest, and frequently of the most revolting, character.

To gain an adequate idea of the vindictive character of these periodical onslaughts on the Catholic Church and the Catholic body, one must perforce recur (1) to the sources of their inspiration, as well as to (2) the lodge organs in which they are gathered together from the four winds of heaven.

(1) The sources from which those platform invectives are drawn are almost invariably the *demi-monde* of the newspaper press, and the lowest class of No-Popery literature: the leaflets, tracts, treatises, controversial catechisms, "awful disclosures,"

[17] See chapter x., *infra*, *note* 73 and text, for remarks on Orange processions in the Australian colonies.

convent "horrors," "abominations," etc., which circulate freely in the lodges, and serve to nourish and intensify the fiery *odium theologicum* of the Orange association. The particular forms of No-Popery "shockers" which find most favour in the lodges possess the two characteristics which distinguish the literature of Exeter Hall: (*a*) the crude style, or, rather, the complete absence of style, which marks the schoolboy's "penny dreadful";[18] (*b*) a peculiarly fierce, and too frequently coarse, virulence against the Catholic body. The pens which wrote them might have been dipped in gall and assafœtida.

(2). We naturally turn to the reports of such papers as the *Victorian Standard* when we wish to get an idea of the character of the utterances which fall from the Orange pulpit and platform. The reader should, however, bear in mind the fact that many of these reports are the carefully expurgated versions which have already appeared in the country press. Nevertheless, the July and August numbers of the *Victorian Standard* give a good general effect of the temper of the mass of Orange speakers. A perusal of the reports, notes, and articles, which appeared in it since its inception, would enable the non-Orange reader to form an idea—although a very inadequate one—of the cornucopia of vituperation which has been poured out upon the Catholic population of one small colony, by one society, in the course of fourteen years. In estimating the spirit and drift of the association, the utterances of the July

[18]This lack of literary quality is peculiarly notable in the prose, and still more in the "poetry" written by Orangemen for Orangemen. The reader is referred to the columns of the *Victorian Standard*, to "Ulsterman's" *Rise and Progress of Orangeism*, and to the various collections of more or less doggerel Orange songs. The laureate of the lodges was one Mr. Robert Young ("Old True Blue") who published a volume of Orange "poems" in the sixties. Among the gems of his poetic fancy is one in which he tunes his lyre to sing of the day

"When William's *eighteen thousand* men
Crushed James's *five-and-twenty*."

Another of his "poems," I remember, had at the end of each verse this soul-stirring refrain:

"Tow, row, row, row, row."

Through some high influence "Old True Blue" contrived to get a pension of £40 a year from the Literary Fund, and, of all others, from the scholarly translator of Homer, Lord Derby, who must never have read a line of the lodge laureate's songs. The grant in question led to a lively little debate in the House of Commons in or about 1867. In anticipation of the debate, all available copies of Young's poems were secured, by his friends, so that the members of the House should not be able to procure any. The London *Morning Star* of that date had some scathing articles on the degradation to which the recipients of the Literary Fund, writers of the highest eminence, had been subjected. Lord Derby admitted that he did not know the character of Young's "poetry" when he granted the pension.

platform cannot be passed lightly over. It is, moreover, fortunate for the cause of truth that these annual displays betray the members of this dark-lantern organisation into a public avowal of its real character. Skolastikos, the Greek Joe Miller, carried a brick to the market-place of Athens as a sample of the house he wanted to sell. The limits of space will permit me to give only such small scraps of July invective. I select, for preference, certain stock phrases or ideas which have been used by scores of speakers and writers besides those to whom they are here referred.

WHIFFS FROM BILLINGSGATE.

1. *The Catholic Church.*—It is an article of faith in the lodges that the Church of Rome is the Scarlet Woman of *Revelations*. This view of the Catholic Church takes the place of a first principle with the *Victorian Standard*, the organ of the lodges of the colony of Victoria. Every succeeding July it finds expression in Orange pulpits or on Orange platforms. At the Beaufort demonstration in 1895 the subject was handled by a Primitive Methodist clergyman in what a Protestant newspaper terms "very strong" language. The preacher referred in terms of high panegyric to a book of a peculiarly acrimonious character, the whole purpose of which is to establish the identity of the Church of Rome with the Mistress of Abominations. "Orangemen," said the speaker, "could establish no better fund than for circulating this book widely."[19] He declared that "Romanism is nothing more than baptised paganism" (this is a favourite expression in the Orange pulpit); that it has "dethroned Christ;" that it is a mass of idolatry, gross superstition, and of moral rottenness "that can't be referred to." When Romanism is destroyed off the face of the earth "a great shout of joy," said the preacher, "shall go up, so that even the angels in heaven shall join therein." A favourite text makes Rome—the Scarlet Woman—"drunk with the blood of the saints."[20] "She is the Romish tiger,"[21] "the Roman octopus,"[22] "the harlot Church."[23] "Vampire" is a favourite epithet for Rome. According to the *Victorian Standard* of July 31, 1896, it was used at the Melbourne demonstration by Grand Chaplain Heathershaw, coupled with another pretty title—"a vixenish Jezabel." But there are deeper depths in Rome; for, say the

[19] *The Riponshire Advocate* (Beaufort, Vic.), July 20, 1895.
[20] *Ibid.*, and *Victorian Standard* reports, July and August, *passim.*
[21] *Victorian Standard*, July 3, 1885.
[22] *Ibid.*, January 1, 1886, p. 6; May, 1893, p. 6 (editorial).
[23] *Ibid.*, May, 1893, p. 6 (editorial).

brethren, she is "a bad leaven in society;"[24] she is likewise "the Church of the Apostate,"[25] "the mother of ignorance, superstition, and degradation;"[26] and, like the monstrous octopus that she is, her "suckers are draining the land of its courage, its vitality, and its self-respect."[27] The full chorus of the brethren cry, *fortissimo*, that she is "the harlot of Babylon."[28] At an Orange demonstration in Maryborough (Victoria) a Rev. Bro. W. Burridge (the "strong" speakers are generally "reverend") is reported to have characterised the Catholic Church as "the deadly enemy of truth-speaking; she made provision for falsehood;" and with her certain falsehoods "are permissible and highly meritorious." Other speakers and writers refer to the Catholic Church as "the bottomless pit of Rome."[29]

At the Maryborough (Victoria) Orange anniversary of 1892 the Rev. Mr. Mathieson (a Wesleyan minister) is reported to have said that the Catholic Church was "a corrupt system of Christianity, and Orangemen would do all in their power to prevent the advancement of that corrupt Christianity."[30] Elsewhere she is described as only "a *nominally* Christian Church."[31] These ideas of the Church of Rome are apparently not sufficiently "advanced" for the large body of Orange orators and writers who define Romanism as "nothing more than baptised paganism." Rev. S. H. Ferguson essayed a still bolder flight at the Melbourne Orange anniversary of 1891. He said: "I deny that the Church of Rome *is a sect of the Christian Church at all, and the Church of Rome* denies it also."[32] Deputy Grand Master R. T. Vale, M.L.A., is reported to have said at an Orange demonstration in Ballarat that the principles of the Catholic Church are confounded with pagan ones.[33] The Grand Chaplain of Victoria—a Primitive Methodist clergyman—vigorously denounced "the half-paganised Church of Rome" at an anniversary celebration in Melbourne; while at Ballarat another reverend brother, according to the *Victorian Standard*, repeated the favourite platform dictum that "Romish" Christianity positively "encourages licentious-

[24] *Ibid.*, August, 1891, p. 4.
[25] *Ibid.*, September 1, 1885, p. 3.
[26] *Ibid.*, August, 1891.
[27] *Ibid.*, May, 1893, p. 6 (editorial).
[28] *Ibid.*, July, 1892, p. 10, and *Victorian Standard*, *passim*.
[29] See, for instance, *Victorian Standard*, January, 1894, p. 10.
[30] *Ibid.*, July 15, 1892. See also *Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser*, July 15, 1892.
[31] *Victorian Standard*, March, 1894, p. 3.
[32] *Ibid.* (own report), August, 1891.
[33] *Ibid.*, August, 1887, p. 8.

ness."[34] Deputy Grand Master R. T. Vale, M.L.A., said at an Orange banquet given to Grand Master the Hon. S. Fraser: "Roman Catholicism is synonymous with ignorance and squalor."[35] At the Melbourne Orange anniversary, in 1893, Dean Macartney said that the Church of Rome is "the enemy of human liberty," and that she "brings slavery to mind and body, to the individual and the nation."[36] Mr. Clements improved on this at the Richmond (Victoria) July demonstration. "Roman slavery," said he, "is worse than black slavery."[37] "The Papacy," said Mr. James Stewart, "is the greatest curse that ever fell upon the human race."[38] Another Orange platform enthusiast, at Portland (Victoria), described the Catholic Church as "setting at defiance all principles of justice and good government;"[39] while one of the limping "poets" of the *Victorian Standard* is satisfied that "Satan and Popery walk hand in hand."[40] The *Contemporary Review* for August, 1896 (p. 227), gives the following extracts from an Ulster Orange ditty, in which the Catholic Church is thus apostrophised:

"Scarlet Church of all uncleanness,
Sink thou to the deep abyss,
To the orgies of obsceneness,
Where the hell-bound furies hiss;
Where thy father Satan's eye
May hail thee, blood-stained Papacy!

"Harlot! cease thy midnight rambles
Prowling for the life of saints,
Henceforth sit in hellish shambles
Where the scent of murder taints
Every gale that passeth by—
Ogre, ghoul of Papacy!"

The columns of the Victorian lodge organ furnish many specimens of this school of poesy. A Past Grand Master, quoted by the *Victorian Standard* of January 5, 1885, declares that the Catholic Church "breeds treachery" and that "treachery is made duty" by her (p. 5). A thousand voices proclaim that the Church of Rome is the sworn enemy of the Bible, of popular education, of science, of progress, and that

[34] *Ibid.*, July 31, 1896.
[35] *Ibid.*, May, 1894, p. 6.
[36] *Ibid.*, July, 1893.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Ibid.*, January, 1885.
[39] *Ibid.*, August, 1892, p. 7.
[40] *Ibid.*, April 30, 1897, p. 14.

she is by nature and necessity a persecutor. We likewise learn (*vide infra*) from the Orange press and platform that Catholics are taught that it is no murder to kill Protestants; that the Church of Rome lives on in hopes of one day "setting her engines of death in motion" against them; and that "all her priests are *sworn* to use the sword" for their extermination.

"Wherever Catholicism exists," said a "Worshipful Master" at Benalla, "there, no matter [in] what country, is need for Orangeism. (Cheers)."[41] The effect of this declaration was somewhat marred by a subsequent statement by the same speaker, to the effect that there were too many "Micks" and "Pats" [Catholics] in the Public Service of the colony. "*At least we think so*," said the speaker, "*and this is the reason why Orangeism exists in Victoria.* (Loud cheers)." The reader will in due course see that the brethren's appreciation of what is termed "an open Bible" is coupled in Victoria, as well as in Belfast and Derry, with a peculiarly keen relish for the lion's share of the offices of honor and emolument in the gift of public bodies or of the Government of the day.

LOVE AND HATE IN HARNESS.

In the reports of Orange demonstrations, gushing professions of "love" for Roman Catholics are, with apologetic intent, occasionally mingled with expressions such as the following: "We hate Roman Catholicism," says the Rev. Bro. Brown at Horsham;[42] "we hate the [Roman Catholic] system," exclaimed Deputy Grand Master Wheeler at Paddington (N.S.W.);[43] "we hate Popery," said Rev. S. H. Ferguson at the Melbourne Orange anniversary of 1891.[44] And so on of many others whose words lie before the writer of these pages. At the Kyneton demonstration in 1891 one of the speakers said: "Orangemen firmly believe that it is their duty to oppose the extension of that [the Catholic] Church."[45] The same idea is stated to have been still more frankly expressed at the Melbourne anniversary in 1893, by Deputy Grand Master R. T. Vale, M.L.A.: "Is it not sheer hypocrisy," this ex-Minister of the Crown is reported to have said, "for us to try and hide the fact *that the object of our existence* is *opposition to the Church of Rome?*"[46] "That organisation," said Brother Baker, at Kyneton, "*we Orangemen oppose with all*

[41] *Ibid.*, August, 1888, p. 9.
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *Ibid.*, September 1, 1885, p. 5.
[44] *Ibid.*, August, 1891.
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid.*, July, 1893.

the energy we possess."[47] The motto of a score of Orange speakers, including Revs. S. H. Ferguson and D. Parker, runs thus: "Our watchword is: '*No peace with Rome!*'"[48] And so on and on, through all the varied moods and tenses of insult and vituperation.

"*L'Eglise: voilà l'ennemi!*" This is the cry in which, with heart and voice, the Orangeman joins with the French infidel —content that revelation should suffer so long as Rome should suffer too.

A DEVIL'S DANCE.

Creed and Ritual.—The speakers and writers who furnish what passes current for literature in the Orange lodges have evidently decided that it is not necessary to possess even a rudimentary acquaintance with the Catholic doctrines and observances which they attack. To them, none the less, the creed and ritual of the overwhelming majority of Christians are a bottomless pit of seething "errors," "superstitions," "abominations," and all uncleanness. This is a fundamental article of faith which no Orangeman who is "in earnest" will presume to doubt. Around these epithets there whirls and eddies a devil's dance of fiery adjectives—"abominable," "monstrous," "detestable," "soul-destroying," "degrading," "pestiferous," "ghoulish," "hellish," "devilish," "fiendish," etc. A score of mouths denounce "the barbarous rites of Rome."[49] Past Grand Master Col. Evans assured his hearers, with ungrammatical lips, that "the peculiar ethics of Rome debauches *(sic)* human character,"[50] The *Victorian Standard* says in a sub-leader:[51] "The Christianity of the Romanist consists in incessant formalism . . and hatred of his Protestant neighbours and the British Government." Rev. S. H. Ferguson has apparently a very low estimate of the sincerity of even devout Catholics. He is reported to have said that their devotion "is simply paper devotion, and only on the surface; it is not from the heart."[52]

That consoling Catholic rite, the Sacrament of Penance, furnishes a topic on which the imagination of certain uneducated Orange clergy of the minor churches runs riot in charges and innuendos of coarse vulgarity against the Catholic clergy and laity. Under the thin pretence of protesting against

---

[47] *Ibid.*, August, 1891.
[48] *Ibid.*, July 3, 1885; August, 1891.
[49] See, for instance, *Victorian Standard*, January, 1885.
[50] *Ibid.*
[51] *Ibid.*, January, 1894, p. 6.
[52] At the Melbourne Orange Anniversary, 1891 (*Victorian Standard*, August, 1891).

certain treatises that are meant for, and restricted exclusively to, private professional use, some of them dwell inordinately, *in public*, and before mixed assemblies, on descriptions of what *they fancy* would happen if the Sacrament of Penance were to be *grossly and flagrantly abused*. A sense of common decency forbids the transferring of extracts on this subject to these pages. I will only refer, in passing, to a series of prurient "lectures" delivered in the colonies on this topic, under Orange auspices, some years ago. They are, in effect, an attack of coarse brutality on the virtue of every Catholic woman and girl who is faithful in the discharge of her most sacred religious observances. The nature of these "lectures" may be inferred from the following fact: In the advertising columns of a Melbourne paper, now before the writer, these "lectures" are offered for sale among a list of publications that are considered by many persons who are competent to judge, to be unfit reading for any respectable man or virtuous woman. In the advertising columns of a paper circulating extensively among the lodges, and now before the writer of these pages, the same disgusting attacks on the most sacred religious practices of Catholics, have been offered as a *premium* to the brethren throughout Victoria. The publication is of a kind that one should handle only with a pair of tongs.[53]

From the rank vulgarity of these press and platform outrages on the feelings of Catholics I turn to the "qualifications" which every lodge candidate is (on paper) supposed to possess *as a condition for membership of the society*.[54] We read: "An Orangeman *should* . . . *cultivate truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity* . . . *ever abstaining from all uncharitable words, actions, or sentiments towards his Roman Catholic brethren.*" *Brethren!* Here again we have "*Fraternité comme Cain avec son frère*"—the brotherly love which Cain showed to Abel.

[53] In 1867 serious disturbances were caused in England by a similar series of coarse "lectures," which were delivered, under Orange auspices, by an itinerant adventurer named Murphy. The mayor of Birmingham refused Murphy the use of the town-hall for his tirades. The "lectures" were then delivered in a wooden building erected for the purpose by the Orange and other supporters of Murphy. The "lectures" were printed and sold in thousands. Serious riots ensued. The military were called out, the Riot Act read, and for two or three days Birmingham was in an uproar. Murphy and the Orange party persisted in this "mischievous agitation," and riots broke out in other parts of England where he appeared. "The pamphlet was ultimately seized under Lord Campbell's Act for suppressing indecent publications, and many thousand copies of it were destroyed." Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, *Hist. of England*, vol. iii., pp. 325-327.

[54] The Rules of all the Orange societies say: "The Master and members of any lodge *must* satisfy themselves, *previous to his* [the candidate's] *admission*, that he possesses the following qualifications."

THE GRAND OLD ENEMY.

II. *The Catholic body.*—(1) *The Clergy.*—On the Catholic priesthood Orange speakers launch forth the full-charged vials of their wrath. It would appear, from the utterances of the Orange press, pulpit, and platform, that all the deep and highly variegated "abominations of the Church of Rome" exist in an extremely concentrated and virulent form in the person of the Pope. He is, *par excellence*, the Man of Sin. He is "a spiritual tyrant," say a score of angry voices;[55] "a tyrannical Herod" quoth Grand Chaplain Heathershaw on the Melbourne July platform.[56] At a July anniversary in Perth (W.A.), a Rev. Mr. Dunstan is reported to have assured his hearers that "the Pope not only sold his forgiveness for sins committed in the past, but even [sold] *his permission and forgiveness for sins to be committed in the future*, according to the price paid."[57] At the Melbourne anniversary of 1895, a Rev. T. J. Malyon—with the help of a few apocryphal extracts—made the Pope claim to be no less a being than *Almighty God Himself!*[58] According to the *Victorian Standard*, his efforts won him "a salvo of applause."[59] A year later, on the same platform, Grand Chaplain Heathershaw averred that the Pope claims *equality* with God, but that, nevertheless, the Man of Sin somehow contrives to make the Almighty "take a back seat."[60] Catholics would deem it a shocking blaspemy to address the occupant of the Roman See as "our Lord God the Pope;" but the editor of the *Victorian Standard*, and quite a little host of whooping orators who take their inspiration from the same founts, are agreed that such a title is conferred by those unspeakable Papists on "Signor Pecci" and his predecessors.[61] The ancient ceremony of homage, kissing the *cross* on the sandal of the "Son of Perdition" was made the subject of strong invective by a Presbyterian clergyman, Rev. M. G. Hart, at an Orange demonstration held in Maryborough (Victoria), in 1887. The speaker is reported to have said that he "would sooner kiss a pig's toe than the Pope's."[62]

[55] E.g., Rev. S. H. Ferguson, *Victorian Standard*, August, 1891.

[56] *Victorian Standard*, July 31, 1896.

[57] *Victorian Standard*, August, 1892.

[58] A complete exposure of this extraordinary story will be found in Rev. Sydney F. Smith's pamphlet, *Does the Pope claim to be God?* It is published by the Catholic Truth Society, London.

[59] *Victorian Standard*, July 30, 1895.

[60] *Ibid.*, July 31, 1896.

[61] See, for instance, *Victorian Standard* editorial, May, 1893, p. 6. The "Signor Pecci" so often referred to by the *Standard* is Pope Leo XIII.

[62] *Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser*, July 13, 1887. Kissing of the feet was an Oriental custom which spread to the West. It was given to emperors, patriarchs, bishops, and the Pope. Late in the middle ages the

The use of the term "Papist" was expressly forbidden as offensive by the 50th of Queen Elizabeth's *Injunctions* of 1559. It is employed, as an insulting epithet, throughout the whole Penal Code of William of Orange, Anne, and the Georges. It is to this day the most opprobrious epithet in the vocabulary of an Orangeman, and is used only when the deadliest insult is intended.[63] One of the favourite party-tunes of the Ulster lodges is: "We'll kick the Pope before us." Their traditional cry is: "To hell with the Pope!"

The most shocking instance of coarse abuse of the Pope which has ever come under the writer's notice is a pæan of rejoicing at the death of Pius IX. It is written, of course, by a clergyman (a Rev. D. T. Taylor), is reprinted at the office of the *Victorian Standard*, and circulated among the lodges, and (occasionally at least) among public institutions, in Victoria. It opens with the words: "The Pope is dead. Amen. Hallelujah!" The writer describes the amiable and saintly old Pontiff as a "huge impostor," a "gigantic humbug," "an immoral fashionable fop," a libertine, "a spiritual tyrant," "an endless beggar and ceaseless bore," a "cheat," "a miser," a "conspirator," "a liar," a gambler, "a curse to mankind," "*this beast*," "Antichrist," the "Man of Sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "the Wicked One" [the Devil], "a product of Satan's working," the "Abomination of earth," etc., etc. The reverend writer states dogmatically that Pius IX. is gone to "Hades," and concludes 134 closely-printed lines with the prayer: "May a merciful Heaven rid the earth of the last vestige of a Pope of Rome. Amen." Some of this clergyman's language is of so coarse a nature that I dare not transfer it to these pages.

CLERGY, CONVENTS, ETC.

The remainder of the Catholic clergy are denounced as rapacious, rebellious, traitorous, tyrannical, etc.;[64] they are "a brutal and ignorant priesthood;"[65] their pet policy to "to keep the masses in ignorance;"[66] they are "trading on the ignorance of the people," said Mr. J. B. Patterson, M.L.A., and others.[67] In Ireland, in recent years, the Catholic priesthood have, we are assured, given "a direct encouragement" to murder.[68]

custom fell gradually into disuse, and was at last confined to the Pope. The *cross* on the sandal is kissed to show that "this honour was done, not to the mortal, but to the Son of God." Kraus, *Encyclopædia of Archæology*.

[63] *Contemporary Review*, August, 1896, p. 226.

[64] *Victorian Standard*, August, 1893; June, 1885, p. 7, and *passim*.

[65] *Ibid.*, leader, August, 1893, p. 6.

[66] *Ibid.*, February, 1894, p. 6 (leader).

[67] *Ibid.*, August, 1887, p. 5.

[68] *Ibid.*, February, 1894, p. 5.

Loyal Orange lodge No. 9 (Melbourne) showed its practical sympathy with a priest's traducers when it voted £2 2s. towards the costs of the Launceston *Daily Telegraph*, the proprietors of which had been compelled to pay £150 damages for a serious libel on Father Coveney, of Dunmanway, Co. Cork, Ireland.[69] An editorial paragraph in the *Victorian Standard* for January, 1895, referred to priests as "*libidinous brutes*." The Boyne issue of the same paper for 1886 contains (p. 4) the following outrageous statement: "Public celibacy is private wickedness." It is aimed at the Catholic clergy; but it is, in effect, a gross imputation on the virtue of every unmarried man and woman—Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Orange—from East to West, and from the North Pole to the South.

(*b*) *Convents*.—The gross imagination of the Orange orator and writer runs riot on what is termed the "conventual system of the Church of Rome." Here the clergy have the floor almost to themselves, and—before mixed audiences—they fling themselves with the perspiring vigor of dancing dervishes into all the wild and screaming gyrations of anti-convent rhetoric. One of the itinerant Orange preachers, a certain Rev. T. J. Malyon, is reported by the *Maryborough Standard* of July 13, 1897, to have referred to English convents as places where women "are kept prisoners at the mercy of a celibate clergy, who have power, unless their behests are obeyed, to inflict on these hapless and helpless victims *torture* under the name of penance." I owe the reader an apology for having inflicted on him even this mildest of doses of Orange anti-convent oratory. A sense of common decency forbids my placing before him any of the more highly-concentrated and nauseous samples which I have met with in rank abundance in the course of my weary

[69] *Ibid.*, August, 1891. The libel consisted in the publication, by the Launceston *Daily Telegraph*, in 1891, of a statement that he had "prayed that God Almighty might bless the hand that murdered Police-Inspector Martin at Gweedore." Rev. George Clark, Congregational minister, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Tasmania, and Very Rev. A. N. Mason, Anglican Archdeacon of Hobart, testified that "such a charge, if true, would unfit the accused for his sacred office, and, if believed, would irretrievably damage the reputation of any minister in Christendom." An apology was refused, even after the proprietor of the *Daily Telegraph* had seen the apology tendered in open court in Ireland, for the very same libel, by the London *Standard*. An offer made by Rev. J. O'Mahony, on behalf of his absent friend, to accept an ample apology, £25, and costs as between solicitor and client, was also scouted. An exclusively Protestant jury awarded Father Coveney £150 damages, and costs. In these circumstances Orangemen showed their practical sympathy for the vilification of the Catholic priesthood. Launceston *Morning Star*, July 11, 1891.

journey through the malodorous realm of Orange "literature.' In the notices, circulars, and placards issued by the Irish Orange leaders in the eighties, the whole Nationalist party, both Catholic and Protestant, were flung together in one promiscuous bundle, and labelled "liars," "slanderers," "rebels," "Fenians," "Socialistic rebels," "rebel conspirators," "rebels and murderers," "murderous butchers," etc. An entertaining series of these war-whoops appeared at the time in the columns of the *Daily Express*, the chief organ of the Irish lodges. A further instalment of them are enshrined in the now too rare phamplet, Mr. Healy's *Loyalty plus Murder*. A chief feature of the "literature" of the lodges consists of lectures and romances which, in coarse language and limping style, launch the most disgusting and wholesale charges of phenomenal immorality, systematic cruelty, torture, infanticide, murder, etc., against the devoted bands of women who have consecrated their lives, without fee or reward, to the cause of education, or to the care of the leper, the sick, the blind, the aged poor, and the orphan. A peculiarly bitter anti-convent romance, *Nightshade*, was written by the notorious Irish Orange leader, Mr. William Johnston, in 1857, and reprinted in 1895. On September 29, 1886, the Grand Committee of the Melbourne Grand Lodge passed the following resolution: That, "in order to have Mrs. O'Gorman Auffray's [anti-convent] lectures fully reported, a weekly issue of the *Victorian Standard* should be printed and circulated among the lodges."[70] Urgent circulars were sent out to the lodges by Grand Secretary Waugh and by the publisher [Burford], appealing to them to take up the matter "in a proper spirit," "as we know what signal service this heroic lady has rendered the cause of Protestantism [Orangeism?] wherever she has lectured."[71] To this day the *Victorian Standard* office circulates among the lodges the old and oft-exposed anti-convent romance, the *Awful Disclosures*,[72] that have been attributed to a poor half-witted Presbyterian named Maria Monk, who spent a notable portion of her unhappy career—where she also ended it—behind the iron doors of a Canadian jail. The foulness of some of the anti-convent fiction

[70] *Victorian Standard*, November 1, 1886, p. 7. The *Victorian Standard* is published once a month.

[71] *Ibid.* A complete refutation of this woman's wild tales, consisting in great part of her own letters, was published in America on the occasion of her first appearance on the lecturing platform, and again at Dunedin and Geelong, in 1886.

[72] The exposure of the Maria Monk fraud will be found in *The True Story of Maria Monk*, mainly a re-print of what appeared in the *Dublin Review* of May, 1836. Catholic Truth Society. One penny.

circulating among the lodges of these colonies is such that no pure-minded man who uses soap and water would handle them except with a pair of tongs and disinfectants. Those who print such literary garbage, or who (like the Orange lodges) circulate it among young men and women, should be debarred from all intercourse with decent society. The writer of these pages can furnish abundant grounds for the opinion to which he has just given such frank expression. In practically every case in which Orange lecturers and romancists fling abominable charges at monastic institutions, they discreetly refrain from giving names of persons or places, so as to baffle inquiry and avoid the clutches of the law of libel.[73] Zolaism will not die so long as an Orange press survives.

But, if we are to believe the "qualifications," the Orange society "will not admit into its brotherhood persons whom an intolerant spirit leads to persecute or *upbraid* any man on account of his religious opinions"; and an Orangeman should "ever abstain from all *uncharitable words*, actions, or [even] *sentiments* towards his Roman Catholic brethren."

PEOPLE THAT WEAR HORNS.

2. Among the thousand and one faults which the twelfth of July orators attribute to the Catholic laity the two most conspicuous are:

(*a*) Disloyalty;

(*b*) Murderous propensities towards Protestants.

(*a*) *Disloyalty.*—Catholics, especially Irish Catholics, are habitually termed "rebels," "rebels of the West and South."[74] "Steeped to the lips in treason" is a favourite phrase.[75] At the Melbourne Orange anniversary of 1886, a well-known

[73] In his issue of January, 1895, the editor of the *Victorian Standard* departed from his usual custom, and incautiously gave names of places and persons, detailing a shocking calumny against the Convent of SS. Joseph and Theresa, at Naples. The proprietor was compelled, besides paying costs, to publish the following in selected portions of three issues of his own paper, and of three consecutive Saturday's issues of the *Argus* and the *Age*, beginning with June 15, 1895:

"In the January issue of our Journal, the *Victorian Standard*, we reprinted from one of our exchanges a report of an alleged scandal, said to have occurred at the Convent of St. Joseph and Theresa at Naples. We have since been assured that the statements made are utterly false and without foundation. We regret that the offending paragraph appeared in this journal, and trust that this explanation may remove any feeling of annoyance to the parties concerned.

C. W. Burford, Publisher *Victorian Standard*."

[74] See, for instance, the *Victorian Standard* reports, etc., December 9, 1884, p. 4; May 2, 1885, p. 5; June 2, 1885, p. 9; July, 1886, p. 10; August 2, 1886; July, 1892; January, 1894, p. 6; May, 1894, p. 3; June 30, 1897 etc.

[75] *Ibid.*, May 2, 1885, p. 5.

clergyman said: "There was but one thing recognised as a crime among the Irish [Catholics], and that was loyalty."[76] The "basis of the institution" in the amended rules of the Irish Grand Lodge, 1814, contains the following: "We shall not persecute anyone on account of his religion, *provided that the same be not hostile to the State.*" The Irish Orange secretary, Swan, when asked by the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 if he thought the Catholic religion "hostile to the State," honestly answered: "I DO."[77] Like the oaths, signs, election rules, etc., the phrase marked above in italics has been quietly omitted from Orange rule-books. The old words are gone, but the old spirit still remains. The profession of the Catholic religion was a crime in the eyes of Victorian Orangemen in 1896, as it was, according to Lord Gosford, among their forerunners in Ulster in 1796. There, by lodge law, part of the punishment for being a Catholic was expulsion from hearth and home. Here, belief in Transubstantion and the Primacy of St. Peter raises a cry for exclusion from employment in the service of the State. I need only refer to the Post-Office Inquiry revelations for proof of this statement.

The French Communist's first principle is: "*La propriété c'est le vol*" (property is theft); and he proceeds to help himself to his neighbour's goods. "Catholics are traitors" is a first principle of the Orange institution; and they carry it into practice by doing what lies in their power to make Victoria what the Corporations of Belfast and Derry have been almost to the present day, as far as Orangemen could make them, close preserves where Catholics were practically excluded from representation and from a share in the public funds. The old spirit of exclusiveness and party ascendency finds many an exponent to this day on the Orange platform in Australia.[78] It is part of the settled policy of the lodges in these colonies, the leaders of which have time and again given expression to opinions such as the following: no Catholic "can be trusted in the service of a Protestant State."[79] An article in the *Victorian Standard* for January, 1895 (p. 4), has the following:

"The Papists seek to secure posts of influence for themselves and their devotees, from a seat in the Government of the nation and Empire, down to the lowest and most retiring

[76] *Ibid.* (own report), August 2, 1886, p. 5.

[77] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 1207.

[78] See *Report* of Melbourne Post Office Inquiry, in Preface.

[79] *Victorian Standard*, July, 1894, p. 7. This is a favourite topic with the Orange organ. Catholic appointments of note in the public service are a subject of comment in its columns, as for instance, the late Mr. Dowden's appointment to the office of Public Librarian, Melbourne.

situation, *where they may exercise their baneful influence. Let us imitate their example*, in courage, perseverance, and eagerness *to obtain such posts for Orangemen.*"

Reference has already been made, in the course of this chapter, to the declaration of a "Worshipful Master" at Benalla, that the great reason why Orangeism exists in Victoria is simply this: that they *think* there are too many Catholics in the Public Service of the colony. This is confirmed by an amended, single-sheet version of what is termed the "Definition of Orangeism" now before the writer of these chapters. It gives the following reason for the society being a *secret* one: "We need a common centre around which Protestants may rally, . . . *more especially as in Canada, the United States, and these colonies, the Civil Service is in the hands of Irish Catholics.*" According, therefore, to the declaration of the L.O.L. press and platform, *a* chief, if not *the* chief, purpose of the societies in these colonies is to drive Catholics from the Public Service, and to fill their places with Orangemen. With such incitements from press and platform, is it any wonder that the rude members of Orange lodges should attempt, by unfounded charges, to drive their Catholic fellow-employés from the service of the State?

In a later chapter we shall see how the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, in the interests of public safety, recommended the urgent and immediate dismissal from the British Public Service, not of Catholics, but of Orangemen; and how, in 1857, a Lord Chancellor of Ireland was forced, by the scandalous conduct of the Orange magistracy of Ulster, to issue an order that none of the brotherhood were to be admitted in the future to the Commission of the Peace.

On the establishment of the first Orange lodges, in 1795, the brethren, by systematic intimidation and violence, forced Protestants in Ulster to dismiss their Catholic employés.[80] To the present day the antipathy of the lodges pursues the Catholic poor, even into their private employments. As a rule, where there is a choice, "no Papist need apply" to an Orange employer. In its issue of (I think) January, 1895, the *Victorian Standard* published uncomplimentary strictures on Catholic domestic servants. The following thinly veiled request to Protestant employers to deal specially with their Catholic employés, appeared in a leader in the *Belfast News-Letter* of July 8, 1886, commenting on tne return of Mr. Sexton, the Home Rule candidate, for West Belfast:

"The second lesson [of the contest] *is perhaps more important*

[80] See chapter iv., *supra*.

[than the first.][81] *The large employers of labour*, the manufacturers, merchants, and traders of this great commercial centre, now know their friends. . . . As a rule, *when men in eminent and influential positions have discovered their friends*, they begin to feel that *it is their duty, as well as their interest, to take care of them.*"

But Orangemen solemnly assure us that it is part of the very "basis of the institution" to rigidly exclude from the brotherhood all "persons whom an intolerant spirit leads to persecute, injure, or upbraid *any* man on account of his religious opinions." Moreover, the public are asked to believe that *before a candidate is admitted to the Orange society* the lodge officers "*must* satisfy themselves" that he possesses the following "qualification" in addition to a whole litany of private and public virtues: that he will "*ever*" [even at Orange demonstrations] abstain from all uncharitable *words*, *actions*, or [even] *sentiments* towards his Roman Catholic *brethren*." Orange practices have been for a century at daggers drawn with Orange professions. Thus far not the slightest attempt has ever been made to bring them into harmony.

ASSASSINS ALL!

I now come to what is, perhaps, the worst feature in this bad business of defamation of the Catholic body from the Orange press and platform. The policy of the Orange leaders seems to be:

(*a*) To excite their rude rank and file to *hatred* of gullible pitch against things and persons Catholic. This purpose is effected in the manner already indicated.

(*b*) Next, to play upon their *fears*.

This latter portion of Orange policy is effected by representing the Catholic body as being for ever plotting against the rights, the liberties, nay, even the *lives* of their Protestant neighbours! It may seem incredible that such statements should be made in this new land, and in the last decade of the nineteenth century. But the evidence of it is simply overwhelming. There are two circumstances which go to show that the wholesale charge of murderous intent is not without effect. They are:

(*a*) The frequent resort made to this charge by Orange speakers and writers in these colonies, especially by clergymen.

(*b*) The palliation or defence of these wild charges—by clergymen, too—in the columns of the public press.[82]

[81] "The first lesson is, that, outside the West Division . . the Parnellites are powerless."

[82] For instance, Rev. W. Parkes, in *Warragul Guardian*, 14th July, 1896. Some of the most sanguinary charges of this kind are contained in an

"Roman Catholics have a superstitious hatred of everything Protestant," said Rev. F. C. Hawkins, at Portland.[83] Again he is reported to have said: "Though neither an open nor a sworn enemy of Protestantism, yet assuredly, Roman Catholicism would at any time welcome its *annihilation. What menace could be greater?*" Grand Master J. C. Neild declared at Sydney that the R.C. Church "works with incessant activity to undermine not only the Protestant faith, but the civil authority."[84] A sub-leader in the Victorian Orange paper (already quoted) states that "the Christianity of the Romanist consists in incessant formalism . . and *hatred of his Protestant neighbours.*" "The one motto of Romanists," said Rev. Bro. D. Parker, "is, 'Death and anathema to religious freedom.'" "Romanism retains the principles of persecution, practices them whenever she has an opportunity to do so, *and only waits* (*sic*) *the power*—as she has the passion—to do as she has done in the past: *to light up other Smithfields, and originate another St. Bartholomew.*"[85] At the Melbourne Orange anniversary of 1887, a Rev. H. A. Langley excited his hearers by making the gentle Cardinal Manning say that one of his main purposes in life was "to *stamp out* Protestantism all over the world."[86] The following year Dean Macartney told his hearers that "Rome" was prepared for massacre.[87] A feature of the lodge organ, the *Victorian Standard*, is the number of screaming articles, reports, etc., which it publishes denouncing Catholics as ever ready to imbrue their hands in the blood of Protestants.[88] An Orange speaker (or writer) in the *Victorian Standard* for July, 1885, speaks of Rome's "bitter regrets over the loss of power *to grind Protestants to powder.* But Rome has not abandoned the hope of some day setting *her engines of death* in motion. . . . One of her priests has said: '*All her priests swear: We will prosecute this cursed evangelical doctrine as long as we have a drop of blood in our veins, and we will eradicate it, secretly and publicly, violently and deceitfully, with words and deeds,* THE SWORD NOT EXCEPTED.'"[89] In the same speech (or article) occur the follow-

Orange leaflet, "in which," said "Brother" Rev. A. Madsen "*fairly and frankly are stated the aims of the L. O. L.*" (Letter to *Ararat Advertiser*, 12th July, 1895). Rev. A. Madsen appears to be the acknowledged Press champion of Orangeism in Victoria.

[83] *Victorian Standard*, August, 1892.

[84] *Ibid.*

[85] *Ibid.*, July, 1885, p. 8.

[86] *Ibid.*, August, 1887.

[87] *Ibid.*, August, 1888.

[88] See, for instance, *Victorian Standard*, May, 1893, p. 7, and the numberless articles on the Inquisition, etc.

[89] The italics and capitals in the alleged quotation are given by the *Victorian Standard.*

ing words: "We know the Papacy is a tremendous conspiracy against the liberties of mankind, *and every man and woman who refused to bow the knee to the Baal of Popery is marked for destruction.*"[90] The same paper publishes the following: "Roman Catholics would *murder* them [Protestants] if they got Home Rule. They are already *smacking their lips in delicious anticipation.* The operation has been recently referred to in one of their own papers as *cutting out the Protestant cancer.*"[91] Similar shrieks of premeditated massacre came in a volley from the Orange press and platform during the Home Rule agitation in the eighties, as the reader can learn by reference to the pamphlet, *Loyalty plus Murder*, and to the columns of the Dublin *Daily Express*.

A tract entitled *Twenty Reasons for being an Orangeman*, circulates extensively among the lodges of Victoria. The "twenty reasons" were written by a former Irish Grand Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Drew, whose wild and inflammatory harangues had so much to do with the riots and bloodshed that occurred at Belfast in 1857. (It is significant that, both in Ireland and the colonies, the clergymen who are promoted to high positions in the Order are precisely those whose utterances are most violent and outrageous to the feelings of their Catholic fellow-citizens). The tract referred to warns Protestants that

(*a*) "The lives of Protestants are [present tense] endangered by Catholics."

(*b*) "The Church of Rome teaches [present tense] in her schools that heresy is not to be endured, *nor heretics to be permitted to live.*"

(*c*) "Popery annually breathes [present tense] denunciations at Rome *against the existence of heretics* (Protestants)."[92]

The leaflet adds dark hints of a coming massacre of Protestants, and concludes by saying "that if we be united . . . the TIME, the MAN, and the DELIVERANCE will come."[93] This tract also gives a bogus "Fenian oath," which breathes throughout blood and slaughter against Protestants.[94] Another issue of the same tract, in the writer's possession, makes the Canon Law declare that it is *no homicide to kill heretics from motives of zeal*; "that the goods of heretics are to be confiscated and applied to the Church;" and that "*no* oath is to be

[90] *Ibid.*, July, 1885, p. 8.
[91] *Ibid.*, July, 1892.
[92] The word "Protestant" is given as above in the original.
[93] The capitals are as in the original.
[94] The oath in question bears no resemblance whatever to the genuine Fenian oath, which is given in A. M. Sullivan's *New Ireland*.

kept toward heretic princes, lords, and others." These latter "extracts" formed the *pièce de résistance* of a typical anti-Catholic speech, delivered by a Rev. T. J. Malyon at an Orange anniversary in Melbourne in 1895.[95] It is needless to say that these alleged "extracts" do not represent the teaching of any Catholic Manual of Canon Law.

The writer of these pages has been assured by several experienced pressmen that many of the most offensive and inflammatory utterances of the Orange platform are studiously suppressed in the country newspaper reports of the July demonstrations, from which they are copied into the pages of the *Victorian Standard*. Nevertheless, we sometimes stumble across such gems of oratory as that in which an excited brother at Maryborough (Victoria) expressed a feverent desire that the Orangemen of Ireland should be "let loose" for the extermination of their Catholic fellow-countrymen.[96] In his evidence before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, the distinguished Presbyterian journalist, Dr. James McKnight, utters a vigorous condemnation of the platform oratory of the Orange association, and of its publication in the columns of the press. "As given in the journals attached to the particular party," said he, "the speeches are in the very coarsest terms of the day; very strong Tory speeches; true Tory and No-Popery speeches. That is the character of the oratory we are regaled by."[97]

WHAT CONCLUSION?

Extracts such as those given above could be multiplied indefinitely. They are to be found in embarrassing profusion in the reports of Orange demonstrations and in other printed matter that circulates among the lodges. But no mere extracts will give an adequate idea of the malignity of the methods by which the rude rank and file of the lodges are, from New Year's Day to St. Silvester's, lashed into a frenzy of fine fury against their Catholic neighbours. The brief quotations given will, however, broadly indicate to the reader

1. The bitter hatred of Orangemen, and *especially of the Orange clergy*, for their Catholic fellow-citizens;

2. The grotesque contrast between the official professions and the official practices of the fraternity;

3. The outrage which the oratorical display of the Orange

---

[95] *Victorian Standard*, July 30, 1895.

[96] See chapter iv., *supra*, p. 68.

[97] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5342; cf. Qq. 5329, 5340. Dr. James McKnight had had at the time forty-two year's experience of press work in Belfast and Derry (Qq. 5324-5325). He was editor of the *Banner of Ulster* (Belfast) and, subsequently, of the *Derry Standard*.

platform (reported generally in the local press) inflicts on the most cherished feelings of the Catholic body.

The "glorious twelfth" is followed by no truce. Evil tales are treasured up and added to month after month by the muck-rakes of the L.O.L. press; and are too often dragged up, with unfriendly intent, in places where Orangemen are associated with Catholics in their daily employments.

Mopsa says in the *Winter's Tale:* "I love a ballad in print, a' life, for then we are sure they are true." The superstition of the printed page lives into our day. It is most rife among the lower orders, the less educated and more gullible classes of the community, such as constitute the great bulk of the membership of the Orange lodges. With a view to forming, from Orange sources, a just idea of Orange feeling towards Catholics, I have, since July, 1896, waded through a great part of the literature that circulates among the lodges of Victoria, including the reports of every demonstration of note that has been held in the colony since the beginning of 1884, as well as of many that have taken place in other parts of Australia, and in Canada and Ulster. The perusal of that mass of printed matter has forced upon my unwilling mind the following melancholy conclusion, every word of which has been carefully considered: It is extremely difficult, if not morally impossible, for the class who form the rank and file of the Orange association to continue, year in year out, to hear and read these persistent and ominous cries of treason, blood, treachery, torture, and general massacre, without settling down into the two following convictions:

(*a*) That their Catholic fellow-citizens are only awaiting the day of power, or other suitable opportunity, to rise at a preconcerted signal and slay Protestants in their beds;

(*b*) That the chief hope of "deliverance" of Protestants from the impending doom, will lie in their being "united" and organised beforehand in the serried ranks of the Orange institution.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that such is not merely the effect, but also the intended purpose, of these philippics, on the body of the members of the Orange association. In all matters regarding the general wickedness and perversity of Catholics, the *gobemoucherie* of the lodges is well nigh incredible. The briefest reference to the society's reading matter will show that in these things L.O.L. writers and speakers are continually putting the credulity of the brethren to the severest strain, without by any means exhausting its wondrous capabilities. "The daughters of the leech cry: More, more!" The pity of this bad business is this: that the most extreme and persistent

of those senseless—I had almost said criminal—alarmists, are not, us a rule, the "lewd fellows of the baser sort," whose words carry little or no weight with their hearers; but the Orange clergy—the men of all others, who, by reason of their sacred calling, ought to endeavour to guide the hearts of the brethren into the gentler paths of peace and goodwill.

Anyone who has noticed the springs of mob violence in history needs not to be told that these persistent and intemperate Orange utterances are a distinct menace to the public safety. They evoke among Orangemen, and especially among the lower orders of Orangemen, a spirit which a spark might kindle into flame, and a passing breeze of political excitement fan into a conflagration. The Gordon and Know-nothing riots are cases in point. The Royal Commission of Belfast, in 1857, gave it as their opinion that the inflammatory utterances of the lodge *chaplains* had a good deal to do with the scenes of riot, bloodshed, murder, and pillage which disgraced the capital of Orangeism in that year.[98] The *Report* of the Derry Commission of 1869 bears similar evidence. And ever since 1795 the histories of these two great centres of Orange life and activity furnish similar instances in melancholy profusion. They are prudent rulers who learn lessons of practical wisdom from the experiences which the pages of history place before them. The Brunswick (Melbourne) L.O.L. demonstration of Sunday, July 19, 1896;[99] the displays which took place in 1897 at the same place and at Prahran, Walhalla, and elsewhere; all prove that the Orange question is looming up in Victoria. We have in our midst, fully organised and preparing, the forces which, with pious phrase and in Christ's sweet name, have crimsoned the streets of Belfast, Derry, Toronto, and so many other places, with the blood of the very fellow-Christians whom they call "brethren."

[98] *Report*, p. 10. Some of the sermons, etc., appear in Appendix to *Report*.

[99] *Argus* and *Age*, July 20, 1896, and July 19, 1897.

Chapter IX.

LOOKING BACKWARD: ORANGE DEMONSTRATIONS VIEWED THROUGH GREEN GLASSES—THE VIOLATED TREATY—THE PENAL CODE: STRIKING THE SHEPHERDS, DISPERSING THE FLOCK—A WILLIAMITE MARRIAGE LAW—BEGGARY BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT—"A GREAT SYSTEM OF BRIBERY"—"THE IGNORANT IRISH."

In the last chapter I have tested the sincerity of the "qualifications of an Orangeman" by the touchstone of a single fact, namely, the language habitually used by the brethren regarding Catholic persons, principles, and practices, during the oratorical portion of the twelfth of July celebrations. The typical Orange demonstration is as Samson without his locks when it is shorn of what I have termed the theatrical display—the procession, with its accompaniment of party emblems and tunes, party cries, etc.

No one who is acquainted with the past hundred years of Ulster history needs to be told that these demonstrations furnish, year after year, at least the occasion of many and serious breaches of the peace. In the course of the next two chapters abundant evidence will be adduced, chiefly of an official kind, to show that they are a chief means of keeping up that dangerous fever-heat of sectarian rancour which forms the chronic disease of the Orange portions of Ulster, and of them alone in all the land. The reasons which make these unnecessary displays not merely impolitic, but, in a sense, criminal, lie on the surface. They may be briefly stated thus:

1. They commemorate events which took place in civil war, and which brought triumph and political and social ascendency to a small minority of the population; defeat, humiliation, social and political degradation to the Catholic majority.

2. The methods of conducting the celebrations are highly calculated to arouse sectarian feeling, to provoke resistance, and thus imperil the public peace.

(*a*) Reference has been made in the last chapter to the always offensive and frequently inflammatory character of the platform attacks on the Catholic Church and its members.

(*b*) Again, Orange anniversaries, processions, etc., have, as a matter of fact, been traditionally made the occasion of studied insult, menace, intimidation, outrage, and too often of strife which has at times almost reached the dimensions of civil war in portions of Ulster. The methods of these demonstrations and their results will form the subject of the two next chapters.

TRIUMPH AND HUMILIATION.

"The society," says Lecky, "took its name from William of Orange, the conqueror of the Catholics."[1] The *Report* of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Derry sectarian riots of 1869, says that these demonstrations are the commemoration of events that were a triumph for one side, "a bitter humiliation for the other."[2] Dr. James McKnight was an Ulster Presbyterian of light and leading, and an ardent admirer of the revolution which placed William of Orange upon the throne of England. In the course of his examination before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, he said: "In the city of Derry and throughout the North of Ireland, every celebration of that kind, both historically and otherwise, is regarded by the conquered party as a triumph of the representatives of the opposite party over them."[3] "So far," he said, "as my knowledge, either of ancient or modern history extends, there is not, and has never been, any civilised State or Government under the sun, ancient or modern, in which the victory of any party over another in civil war was allowed, with the single exception of poor Ireland itself . . . No statesman who really understands the importance of national unity, and of keeping up what I call the living defences, would allow it."[4] Had such commemorations been permitted in England, the country, he added, "would not have been civilized from the days of William the Conquerer. The country would have been broken up into factions, and never would have become a united nationality, as it now is. No community ever could, in any part of the world. Neither Greeks nor Romans ever tolerated the celebration of a civil war victory, nor any other Government that I know of."[5]

Judge Fletcher (a Protestant), in the course of his historic charge to the Wexford Grand Jury, in 1814,[6] said: "Gentlemen, I do repeat that these are my sentiments, not merely as

[1] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 427.
[2] *Report*, p. 15.
[3] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5329.
[4] *Ibid.*, Q. 5327.
[5] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5375.
[6] This was re-published by the Irish Press Agency, London, in 1886.

an individual, but as a man discharging his judicial duty. With these Orange associations I connect all commemorations and processions, producing embittering recollections, and inflicting wounds upon the feelings of others; and I do emphatically state it as my settled opinion that, until these associations are effectually pulled down, and the arms taken from their hands, in vain will the North of Ireland expect tranquility or peace."

The Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the great Belfast riots of 1857, say in their *Report*: "The rules and proceedings of the Grand Lodge for the years 1855, 1856, and 1857 we shortly refer to, as showing the nature of that organisation, and showing, we think, its evil tendencies as regards the peace and good feeling which ought to exist amongst the various classes of this country. It is an exclusive society of Protestants; *a leading feature of it seems to be to keep up a brotherhood to celebrate the triumph of their class over the Roman Catholics*, called in their proceedings, Papists. . . . This strongly expressed feeling against so large a class of their fellow-countrymen seems a perilous bond of union for a virtually secret society, embracing within it so largely the uneducated classes of society."[7] The same Royal Commission condemns in its *Report* the "annual celebration of a festival which is used to remind one party of the triumph of their ancestors over those of the other, and to inculcate the feeling of Protestant superiority over their Roman Catholic neighbours, and we refer your Excellency to the sermon of Dr. Drew . . . as a sample of such Orange teaching."[8] "Unfortunately," continue the same Royal Commissioners, "its celebration [that of the Revolution of 1688] is now regarded in the North of Ireland as the *celebration of the triumph of one class over another, and the establishment of a Protestant ascendency*. . . . As celebrated, it is regarded as *a studied insult by the Roman Catholics*, and as *a triumph by the Orangemen*, and a declaration of their superiority over their Roman Catholic brethren."[9]

The *Encyclopædia Britannica*[10] says: "By repeating irritating watchwords, and publicly keeping anniversaries painful to their neighbours, Orangemen have done much to inflame sectarian animosity."

The events commemorated by the Orange anniversaries are of too recent date to be forgotten by the bulk of the Irish people. In the Orange portions of Ulster the bitter memories

[7] *Report*, pp. 10-11.
[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[10] Ninth ed., art. "Orangemen."

of persecution, degradation, and party ascendency are studiously kept alive by what an Irish Chief-Secretary termed "the annual specimen of civil war." The Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the great Derry sectarian riots of 1869, referring to the Catholics of that city, say in their *Report* that they were "all more or less acquainted with the history of events that cause them to look on the local anniversaries as offensive to themselves. Here, then," they continue, "we find the reason for the existence of increased discontent with these celebrations."[11]

An inquiry into the nature of the triumph on the one side, and of the humiliation on the other, will enable the reader to estimate in some degree the feelings which the celebration of "the glorious twelfth" arouses in the minds of different sections of the Irish people.

THROUGH GREEN AND ORANGE GLASSES.

To the Irish Orangeman and the Irish Catholic, the Revolution of 1688, the battle of the Boyne, the fall of Limerick, and the triumph of William of Orange, bring very different—even opposite—sets of memories. The successful rebel is ever, in the eyes of many, a hero. The rebels who fought under the Prince of Orange against King James were successful. The loyalist Irish Catholics who vainly fought for a worthless, but hereditary sovereign—"to whom," says Lecky, "all classes had sworn allegiance"[12]—suffered by the Revolution, as they had suffered by the Restoration; they were penalised for their fidelity to James as well as for their fidelity to Charles. They have, moreover, suffered ever since.

The triumph which Orangemen celebrate did not consist in any commercial advantage that it brought to the country at large; for William III. did what lay in his power to ruin the Irish woollen trade and cripple the resources of the country.[13] What the Orangemen set in the forefront, what they were long *sworn* to maintain—even at the cost of their loyalty to the throne[14]—what they still long to see revived, is the *party ascendency* which the Williamite victory conferred on the triumphant minority. This ascendency placed in the hands of members of the favoured creed the three following huge monopolies:

1. A practical monopoly of the lands of Ireland;

[11] *Report*, p. 17.

[12] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 141.

[13] *English Statutes*, 7 and 8 William III., c. 22; *Irish Statutes*, 10 William III., c. 5. Consult Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, pp. 34-37; and the present chap., *infra*.

[14] Cf. chap. v., *note* 3, *supra*, p. 84, and chap. xv., *infra*.

2. A monopoly in the making of the country's laws;

3. A monopoly of all public offices of honour and emolument, civil and military, under the State, coupled with a monopoly of the learned professions.

These privileges were secured to the dominant minority

1. By the violation of the Treaty of Limerick;

2. By the passing of the Irish Penal Code, the purpose of which was to degrade and brutalise the great bulk of the Irish people, and to crush out of their hearts every vestige of their ancient faith.

THE BROKEN TREATY.

The Treaty of Limerick, which closed the revolutionary war in Ireland, was signed in 1691 by the Lords Justices of Ireland, on behalf of the Crown, and ratified later on by William and Mary, under the Great Seal of England.[15] "The stipulations of the Irish," says Lecky, "in favour of religious liberty were given the very first place in the treaty that was signed."[16] The very first of the "Civil Articles of Limerick" guaranteed the Catholics of Ireland the free exercise of their religion, such as they had enjoyed in the reign of Charles II., together with a promise of Acts of Parliament to still further "preserve them from *any disturbance* on account of their said religion."[17] Article II. guaranteed the followers of King James the peaceful possession of their estates, etc., and the free exercise of their professions.[18] Article IX. provided that the oath to be taken by Irish Roman Catholics should be the following oath of allegiance, "*and no other*": "I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary. So help me God."

"Such a treaty," says Lecky, "was very reasonably regarded as a solemn charter guaranteeing the Irish Catholics against any further penalties or molestation on account of their religion."[19] "The public faith," he adds, "was pledged to its observance."[20] Yet, the treaty was shamefully violated by the wholesale confiscation of the property of Irish Catholics, and by the passing of the Penal Code. Lecky says: "The imposition upon the Irish Catholics, without any fresh provocation, of a mass of new and penal legislation . . .

---

[15] McGee's *Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. x., p. 196; Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 139.

[16] Lecky, *ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. v., p. 323.

[19] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 139.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

was a direct violation of the plain meaning of the treaty."[21] Walpole, another Protestant historian, refers to this great act of public treachery in the following terms: "The perjured Roman Senate, when their army had surrendered at the Caudine Pass, could hardly have surpassed the Irish Government in flagrant breach of faith."[22]

This, then, is the first memory which the Orange anniversaries of the Williamite victory bring to the minds of Irish Catholics. William III., says Lecky, "is identified in Ireland with the humiliation of the Boyne, with the destruction of Irish trade, and with the broken treaty of Limerick."[23] Another bitter memory recalled by Orange demonstrations is that of one of the chief results of the battle of the Boyne and the fall of Limerick: the long agony of suffering and wrong inflicted on Irish Catholics by the penal laws. This fearful Code "began under William."[24] Whatever may have been his personal ideas of religious toleration, he certainly "never offered any serious or determined opposition to the anti-Catholic laws which began in his reign."[25] This is all the more remarkable, since he possessed "the royal veto, which could have arrested any portion of the Penal Code."[26] While exercising it in England, he failed to put it into execution as far as Ireland was concerned, even though he was bound to it by the solemn treaty to which he was himself a party. The penal laws passed during the reigns of William and Anne were, says Walpole, "of a character quite unparalleled, and were in flagrant violation of the treaty of Limerick."[27]

A glance at the main provisions of the Irish Penal Code—

---

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

[22] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. v., p. 324. Lecky blames the English Parliament for its share in passing the Penal Laws, and violating the Treaty of Limerick. His grounds of censure are briefly as follow: (1) An English Act of Parliament made the Irish Parliament exclusively Protestant. (2) The royal veto could have arrested part of the Penal Code, and did not. (3) Poynings' Act placed the Irish Parliament completely at the mercy of the English. (4) No Irish Bill could be laid before the Irish Parliament until approved by the English Privy Council. (5) No Irish Bill could become law except in the precise form sanctioned by the English Privy Council. *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 145.

[23] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 120,

[24] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 141.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 145. Lecky says (p. 141) that William repeatedly "refused his assent to English [penal] Acts which he regarded as inimical to his authority." In his *Leaders of Public Opinion* (p. 120) he says: "The ceaseless exertions of the extreme Protestant party have made him [William] far more odious in the eyes of the people than he deserves to be; for he was personally far more tolerant than the majority of his contemporaries."

[27] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. vi., p. 332.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE

the fruit of the Williamite victory—will enable the reader to enter to some extent into the feelings with which the celebration of the "glorious revolution" and the "glorious twelfth" is viewed by Irish Catholics. This body of laws was intended, says Walpole, "to stamp out the Roman Catholic religion altogether" in Ireland.[28] It began in the Acts of the seventh and ninth years of William III.; was still further elaborated in what the same Protestant writer terms the "savage Acts of the second and eighth years of Queen Anne;"[29] and culminated in the Act of the seventh year of King George II. These statutes, published in full, would make a fair-sized volume. Only the main provisions of this infamous Code shall be here set forth, in a highly condensed form, the reader being referred for more detailed information on the subject to the English and Irish Statutes of the different periods, and to the works of such Protestant writers as Hallam, Lecky, Walpole, Edmund Burke, Young, Godkin, Sydney Smith, etc.[30] The reader is requested to note the following features of the Irish Penal Code:

1. The circumstances of its enactment and continuance: It was inflicted not merely in defiance of treaty rights, but without provocation, and continued in spite of the loyalty of the Irish Catholic body during the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, and the disturbances of 1719, 1722, and 1725.[31]

2. The prominent part which the spy and the informer were made to play in this sad drama of a nation's sufferings.[32]

3. The extreme severity of the penalties and other disabilities provided against the practice of the Catholic religion. The money fines alone represent, at the present day, sums many times greater than the number of pounds stated in the Statutes.

4. The nature of the bribes offered to the clergy, and to undutiful wives and children, to allure them into apostacy from the faith of their fathers.

---

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 338. In 1795 King William assured the Irish Parliament that he was intent on the firm settlement of Ireland on a Protestant basis. Godkin, the *Land War in Ireland*, p. 236.

[29] *Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 338.

[30] Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, pp. 120. *sqq.*; *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp, 130, *sqq.*; Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*; Burke, *Tract on the Popery Laws*; Young, *A Tour in Ireland*, vol., ii.; Hallam, *Constitutional History*; Scully, *Statement of the Penal Laws*: Sydney Smith, *Peter Plymley's Letters* (especially letter ix.); the same author's *Ireland and England*, and his review of Moore's *Captain Rock*; Cobbett's *Reformation*, chap. xv.; Mitchel's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chaps. iv., x. See also Scully's *Penal Laws*; Beaumont's *L'Irlande politique, sociale, et réligieuse* (Introduction historique); and Godkin's *Land War in Ireland*, pp. 234, *sqq.*

[31] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 139, 141-144.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

STRIKING THE SHEPHERDS.

The following provisions regarded the Irish Catholic clergy:

1. *Banishment.*—All unregistered Catholic clergy were ordered "to depart out of this kingdom before the first day of May, 1698." This included all "archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all other regular Popish clergy, and all Papists exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction." The penalty for non-compliance was imprisonment without bail until such time as they could be transported beyond the seas. Any Popish archbishop, etc., as above, who came into the country after December 29, 1697, was liable to twelve months' imprisonment and transportation beyond the seas. Those who, having been banished, returned to the country again, were to be "judged traytors," and to "suffer, lose, and forfeit, as in the case of high treason."[33] The penalty was this: They were half hanged, *disembowelled while still living*, and then quartered. This, as Lecky truly observes, was "the most horrible form of death known to British law."[34] A similar Act was passed in the reign of Queen Anne.[35] In 1719 the exclusively Protestant Irish House of Commons passed a Bill ordering all unregistered priests found in Ireland to be branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron. This was ratified by the English ministry.[36]

2. *Abjuration.*—For a time *registered* clergymen were permitted, under very severe restrictions, to exercise a portion of their ministry. The *Act for registering the Popish Clergy*[37] provides that "no Popish parish priest shall have any Popish curate or assistant." According to the Protestant Archbishop King, "*the design was that there should be no succession*" of such registered priests.[38] The Act of 8 Anne, c. 3, took even this small comfort from the people, as it required the clergy to

---

[33] *9 William III.*, cap. 1, secs. 1-3.

[34] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 164. A Bill brought in by the Irish Commons in 1723 requires all unregistered clergy to depart out of the Kingdom before March 25, 1724, unless they had previously taken the oath of Abjuration of Popery. The penalty was the same as for high treason. "By another clause," says Lecky (i., 164) "it was provided that all bishops, deans, monks, and vicars-general found in the country, should be liable to the same horrible fate, and *in their case their abjuration oath was not admitted as an alternative.*" The Bill contained other equally drastic provisions. Lecky says that "Mr. Froude warmly supports this attempted legislation" (p. 165, *note*).

[35] *2 Anne*, cap. 3.

[36] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 162-163.

[37] *2 Anne*, c. 7, sec 3; *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 19.

[38] *Letter to Sunderland*, quoted by Lecky, *op. cit., supra.*, p. 169, *note*. See Mant, *Hist. of the Church of Ireland*, ii., 212, and Swift's *Works*, viii., 367.

renounce the Catholic faith. Contrary to the articles of the Treaty of Limerick, it enacted that, by March 25, 1710, all the registered priests in Ireland must take the oath of Abjuration of Popery, and subscribe the declaration against Transubstantiation. Failing compliance with this act of apostacy from their faith, they were to suffer banishment for life. If they returned, the death penalty awaited them.[39]

3. *Suppression of religious houses.*—Magistrates and mayors were ordered to suppress all friaries, etc., and to apprehend all unregistered clergy. Neglect of this duty made them liable to be fined £100 (a vast sum in those days), and to be disqualified from acting as magistrates for the remainder of their lives.[40] *Half of the fine went to the informer.* One of the Williamite Acts, re-enacted in the reign of Queen Anne,[41] forbids burial of the dead in any suppressed monastery, abbey, or convent, or in the precincts thereof, under a penalty of £10, *half of which went to the informer, such sum to be recoverable from any person present at such burial.*

4. *Priest-hunting.*—Informers were offered the following rewards for the "discovery" of Catholic ecclesiastics exercising the functions of their ministry in Ireland: For an archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, £50; for each friar or unregistered priest, £20.[42] These rewards, says Lecky, "called a regular race of priest-hunters into existence."[43] Their operations were facilitated by the two following provisions of the Penal Code:

(*a*) Any two magistrates could compel any Catholic over eighteen years old to declare where and when he had last heard Mass, the name of the celebrant, and of the persons who were present at it, and the residence or hiding-place of any Popish ecclesiastic. Any Papist refusing to be sworn, or to give such information, was liable to be imprisoned for twelve months unless he paid a fine of £20.[44]

(*b*) Any person relieving or harbouring an unregistered Catholic clergyman after May 1, 1698, was subject to the

---

[39] *8 Anne*, cap. 3, sec. 22. The English Grand Lodge illegally adopted the declaration against Transubstantiation, when compelled by law to expunge the Orange oath from its *printed* rule-books.

[40] *2 Anne*, cap. 7.

[41] *9 William III.*, c. i., sec. 6; *2 Anne*, c. 7.

[42] *8 Anne*, c. 3., sec. 20.

[43] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 161; cf. pp. 254, *sqq.* In 1719 the Irish (Protestant) House of Commons urged the magistrates to greater activity in enforcing the penal laws, and passed a resolution "that the prosecuting and informing against Papists was an honourable service to the Government." Lecky, *ibid.*, p. 162.

[44] *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 21. Cf. Lecky, i., 161.

following penalties: For the first offence a fine of £20; for the second, a fine of £40; for the third, forfeiture of all his lands, goods, and chattels—*one-half* (not to exceed £100) *to go to the informer*, the remainder to the Crown.[45] This was one of the Williamite statutes. It was re-enacted in *2 Anne*, c. 2.

5. *Conversion* of Protestants, or their reconciliation to the Catholic faith, was met by the following provisions: Any person inducing a Protestant to become a Catholic, or to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, and the person so reconciled or converted, were both made guilty of the crime of *præmunire*,[46] or contempt of the royal prerogative, as laid down in the Statute of *16th Richard II.* The penalty for this high crime was imprisonment for life and forfeiture of all goods and chattels.

6. *Apostacy* was encouraged among the persecuted Catholic priesthood by the offer of a bribe, namely, an annuity of £20 (a large sum for those days.) This was later on raised to £30 a year, and in both cases was to be levied off the county in which the priest had last resided.[47]

A WILLIAMITE MARRIAGE LAW.

7. If any Protestant woman, possessed of land to the value of £500 or more, married *any person* without a certificate from a bishop, minister, or magistrate, that he was a "known Protestant," both she and her husband would forfeit their estates to the next Protestant heir. Any Protestant who married a Catholic, or permitted his children to be brought up as Catholics, was to be deemed a Papist, and to be subject to all the disabilities of a Papist. Anyone giving them in marriage was liable to a year's imprisonment and a fine of £20.[48] In the time of George I. Parliament passed an *Act to prevent*

[45] *7 William III.*, c, i., sec. 4.

[46] *2 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 1.

[47] *2 Anne*, c. 7; *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 18. Readers will remember the encouragement given to this class, in their fall, by the Orange lodges, which despise and vilify them while they hold an honoured place in their ministry. See chap. viii., *supra*.

[48] *9 William III.*, c. 3, *An Act to prevent Protestants intermarrying with Papists*. Cf. Lecky, i., 152. Compare the rule of the Orange society (pp. 96-97, *supra*) which makes "marrying a Papist" a matter for immediate expulsion. Howard's *Popery Cases* (p. 60) contain a judicial decision that a Papist or "a Protestant who intermarried with Papists was incapable of being a discoverer [of Popish clergy], the Court holding that such a Protestant is a more odious Papist within the Acts than a real and actual Papist by profession and principle." Howard's *Popery Cases* were compiled for the use of lawyers. By the Act of 19 George II. c. 13, every marriage was *legally invalid* that was celebrated by a priest between two Catholics, one of whom had been a Catholic less than twelve months, and the priest performing such marriage was guilty of a felony. The statute 33 George

marriages by degraded Clergymen and Popish Priests.[49] One of its provisions imposes the penalty of death without benefit of clergy on any priest convicted of marrying two persons either of whom was a Protestant.[50] By virtue of a provision in an amending Act of the eighth year of Queen Anne any priest *prosecuted* for having celebrated such a marriage was deemed to be guilty "unless the said Popish priest shall produce a certificate of the minister of the parish where the parties so married resided, certifying that they were not of the Protestant religion."[51] By a subsequent Act of George II. all such marriages were declared null and void.[52]

Such are a few of the memories which the annual celebration of the Boyne victory brings to the minds of Irish Catholics: the long and bitter war against their clergy and creed, which was inaugurated, in the face of a solemn treaty, after the triumph of the Prince of Orange.

BEGGARY BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.

The laws against the Irish Catholic laity were of scarcely less ferocious a character than those which affected the lives and liberties of the clergy. They ran mainly on the following lines:

1. Restrictions as to the ownership of property, coupled with temporal allurements to apostacy which struck at the most sacred relations of social and domestic life.

2. Restrictions as to the education, etc., of the children of Catholics.

3. Deprivation of all share in public representation; the closing of public employment, of the learned professions, etc., to the Catholic majority in Ireland.

1. *Restrictions as to property.*—"The Penal Code," says Lecky, "as it was carried out, was inspired much less by fanaticism than by rapacity. . . . It was intended to make them [the Catholics] poor, and to keep them poor, to crush in them every germ of enterprise, to degrade them into

---

III. c. 27, removed the invalidating clause, but imposed the penalty of fine or imprisonment. Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1870 had this law repealed, and in 1871, by the statute 34-5 Vic. c. 110, s. 38, made the Irish law practically similar to the law as it is in England. For fuller information on this subject, see the end of this chapter.

[49] *12 George I.*, c. 3.

[50] In 1726 a Catholic priest, Rev. Timothy Ryan, was executed at Gallows Green, Limerick, for the offence mentioned above. *Our Martyrs*, Rev. D. Murphy, S.J., p. 69, *note*.

[51] *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 26. This Act amends *An Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery*.

[52] *19 George II.*, c. 13.

a servile caste, who could never hope to rise to the level of their oppressors."[53] The restrictions as to property covered (*a*) the purchase, holding, or enjoyment of property; (*b*) the devising or inheritance of property.

(*a*) Catholics were made incapable of holding either directly, or through others in trust for them, any lands, tenements, rents, or annuities either for a life or lives or for any term of years.[54] They were also forbidden to buy any interest in land, either in their own name or in that of others, save by *leasing*. Every such lease was subject to these two conditions: (1) It should not be for more than 31 years; (2) *the rent should not be less than two-thirds* of the *full annual value of the land*.[55]

What Walpole terms the "ferocious statute" of the eighth year of Queen Anne (c. 3) made it difficult, if not impossible, for friendly Protestants to hold land in secret trust for Catholics. A common informer could compel any person to discover such secret trusts. All issues of fact were to be tried by a jury of "known Protestants." In the event of a decision in favour of the informer, *he was at once entitled to the lands affected by the trust*.[56] "The whole country," says Lecky, "was soon filled with spies, endeavouring to appropriate the property of Catholics; and Popish discoveries became a main business of the law courts."[57] No Catholic could hold a mortgage on land or receive an annuity chargeable on land.[58] The lands of the Catholic Irish were confiscated to the extent of 1,060,792 Irish acres.[59] Walpole, the Protestant historian, says: "So wholesale and complete had been the transfer of the land from the Roman Catholic proprietors to the Protestants, that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the era of summary confiscation by forfeiture may be said to close, the former [the Catholics] were the owners of less than one-seventh of the whole area of Ireland."[60]

In reply to an address by the English Lords and Commons, June 9, 1698, King William said: "I shall do all that in me

---

[53] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 152.

[54] *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 1. See Young's *Tour in Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 141; Godkin's *Land War in Ireland*, p. 237

[55] *2 Anne*, cap. 6, sec. 6; Godkin, *loc. cit.*

[56] *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 27.

[57] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 152.

[58] *2 Anne*, cap. 6; *8 Anne*, c 3.

[59] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. v, pp. 326, 327. Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, p. 236. The Irish acre contains 7840 square yards, the English, 4840. The reader will recall the wholesale plunder and confiscation of the property of Catholics with which the Orange society was inaugurated. See chap. iv., *supra*, pp. 71, *sqq*.

[60] *Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 329; cf. Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, p. 236.

lies to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland." This was, as Lecky says, "the main industry of Ireland." It was destroyed at one fell stroke by the Act of *10 and 11 William III.* cap. x., which was passed in 1699, and which prohibited the export of wool or woollens from Ireland *to any country whatever*, under penalty of forfeiture of ship and goods and a fine of £500 for every such offence.[61] "So ended," says Lecky, "the fairest promise Ireland had ever known of becoming a prosperous and a happy country. The ruin was absolute and final,"[62] and fell upon Protestants and Catholics alike. The Williamite law deprived vast numbers of people, without warning, of the means of livelihood—among them some 42,000 Protestant families, who, according to a contemporary authority, had been engaged in the woollen industry in Ireland.[63] Within two years from the passing of this Act, 20,000 to 30,000 workers in wool were reduced to beggary, and had to be supported at the public expense.[64] Great numbers emigrated to the continent of Europe. Others fled to North America, where in due course their descendants took a leading part in the War of Independence.[65] A promise made by William to encourage the small Irish linen and hempen trade was never fulfilled by him.[66] When, in the reign of Queen Anne, some very slight encouragement was given to the Irish flax and hempen industries, Catholics were to a great extent deprived of a share in the trifling boom. No Catholic was permitted to have more than two apprentices at a time, and these had to be indentured for *a term of not less than seven years*, under a penalty of £100, to be recoverable by the public prosecutor.[67]

Catholics were forbidden by law to purchase or lease a house in the cities of Galway or Limerick, or their suburbs.[68]

[61] Swift McNeill, *English Interference with Irish Industries* (Cassell, 1886), p. 33. Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, ed., 1892, vol. i., p. 177.

[62] Lecky, *ibid.*

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

[64] *Ibid.*, *note* (Hely Hutchinson's figures).

[65] Arthur Dobbs, and Right Hon. Luke Gardiner, quoted by Swift McNeill, *Irish Industries*, pp. 58-61. See Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, pp. 249, *sqq.*

[66] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 178-179. "In spite of the compact of 1698," says Lecky, "the hempen manufacture was so discouraged that it positively ceased" (*ibid.*, p. 179). "In 1700," says the same author, "the value of the whole export of Irish linen amounted to a little more than £14,000" (*ibid.*, p. 178).

[67] *2 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 37.

[68] *8 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 23; *4 George I.*, c. 15, sec. 1. They were likewise excluded from Bandon, Enniskillen, Belturbet, etc. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, i., 268-269. In Derry, the "nine o'clock bell," which formerly warned the Catholics to leave the walled portion of the city, continues to be rung to the present day.

No Catholic was allowed to "have or keep in his possession, or in that of anyone else for him, any horse, gelding, or mare which shall be of the value of £5." Any Protestant was empowered to obtain a search-warrant, break open doors, etc., and, on tendering £5 to the owner or in his absence to the magistrate, was entitled to the possession of the hunter or carriage-horse belonging to a Catholic. Any Papist concealing, or aiding to conceal, such horse, was liable to be sent to jail for three months, and to "forfeit treble the value of said horse."[69] This was one of the Williamite laws. O'Conor, in his *History of the Irish People* (p. 209), gives an instance of the working of this Act: "A Protestant walked up to a Catholic who rode a splendid horse on a racecourse, offered him £5, and arrogantly ordered him to dismount. The gentleman dismounted, drew out a pistol, and shot his horse through the brain." By sections 4 and 18 of *2 George I.* the horses of Papists might be seized and detained for ten days for the use of the militia. At the end of that time the authorities had the option of purchasing the animals at £5 each; otherwise they returned them, *provided the owners paid the sum demanded for their seizure, removal and maintenance.*

BRIBERY.

(*b*) *Wills and Inheritance.*—The penal laws that regarded the devising and inheritance of property formed, says Lecky, "a gigantic system of bribery, intended to induce the Catholics to abandon or disguise their creed." Of all the subjects of the Crown, Catholics alone were, by law, incapacitated from either devising by will or inheriting by will. Few Catholic landowners remained after the confiscations. At their death their estates were divided equally among their sons, unless the eldest son became a Protestant, in which case he inherited the whole.[70] In this way Catholic landowners were either slowly but surely impoverished, or their estates passed into the hands of Protestants. In Lecky's words, "these measures . . . appear to have rankled more than any others in the minds of the Catholics, and they produced the bitterest and most pathetic complaints. The law I have cited, by which the eldest son of a Catholic, upon apostatising, became the heir-at-law to the whole estate of his father, reduced his father to the position of a mere life-tenant, and prevented him from selling, mortgaging, or otherwise disposing of it, is a typical measure of this class. In like manner a wife who

[69] *7 William III.*, c. 5, sec. 20; *10 William III.*, cc. 8, 9; *2 Anne*, c. 6; *8 Anne*, c. 3; *2 George I.*, c. 9; *6 George I.*, c. 10; *1 George II.*, c. 9; *9 George II.*, c. 3; *15 and 16 George III.*, c. 21.

[70] *2 Anne*, c. 6; *8 Anne*, c. 3.

apostatised was immediately freed from her husband's control, and the Chancellor was empowered to assign to her a certain proportion of her husband's property. If any child, *however young*, professed to be a Protestant, *it was at once taken from its father's care.* The Chancellor, or the child itself if an adult, might compel the father to produce the title deeds of his estate, and declare on oath the value of his property; and such a proportion as the Chancellor determined was given to the child.[71] Children were thus set against their parents, and wives against their husbands, and jealousies, suspicions, and heart-burnings were introduced into the Catholic home. The undutiful wife, the rebellious and unnatural son, had only to add to their other crimes the guilt of a feigned conversion, in order to secure both impunity and reward, and to deprive those whom they had injured of the management and disposal of their property."[72]

The Penal Code, continues the same Protestant writer, "blasted the prospects of the Catholic in all the struggles of active life. It cast its shadow over the inmost recesses of his home. It darkened the very last hour of his existence. No Catholic, as I have said, could be guardian to a child; so the dying parent knew that his children must pass under the tutelage of Protestants."[73] What Lecky terms this "atrociously cruel" provision of *2 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 4, directed that the dying Catholic parent could not leave his children to the care of his wife or friends. "The Chancellor," says he, "was bound to provide them with a Protestant guardian, whose first duty was to bring them up in the Protestant creed."[74] The same Act made any Papist who acted as guardian of a child liable to a fine of £500.[75]

Such were some of the direct or indirect results which, in defiance of the Articles of Limerick, the Williamite victory brought to the Catholics of Ireland; such the associations which the annual celebrations of that victory bring to the minds of the descendants of those who were made to feel the bitter brunt of that ferocious Code.

"THE IGNORANT IRISH."

"A second object of the penal laws," says Lecky, "was to

[71] *Ibid.* See Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, p. 237. The conforming wife also received a jointure out of the estate.

[72] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i, p. 153. Cf. Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. vi., pp. 338-339; Young's *Tour in Ireland*, vol. ii., sec. vii., (Bell and Sons' ed., 1892).

[73] Lecky, *ibid.*, p. 154. The words of the section are quoted in footnote on same page.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

[75] *2 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 4.

reduce the Catholics to a condition of the most extreme and brutal ignorance. . . . The legislation on the subject of Catholic education may be briefly described, for it amounted simply to universal, unqualified, and unlimited proscription."[76] Some of the most shocking of these laws were passed during the reign of William of Orange, who, by the exercise of the royal veto, could have at any time arrested this or any portion of the Penal Code.

1. *Laws against Catholic Teachers.*—No Catholic was allowed to "instruct a youth in learning," either "publicly or in private houses." The penalty for infringement of this Act was a fine of £20 and imprisonment without bail or mainprize for three months for every such offence.[77] The Act of the eighth year of Queen Anne forbade Catholics to teach publicly or privately *in any capacity*, even as under-masters or assistants to a Protestant schoolmaster. Any Catholic found guilty of contravening this provision of the Act was to be deemed "a Popish regular clergyman," and "to incur such penalties as any Popish regular convict." Any Protestant found guilty of "entertaining" any such Catholic tutor was liable to a fine of £10, half of which went to the informer.[78]

A reward of £10 was offered for such information as would lead to the apprehension and conviction of "any Popish schoolmaster, or any Papist teaching in private houses as tutor, usher, or assistant to any Protestant schoolmaster."[79] The professional priest-hunter was scarcely less eager on the scent of the Catholic schoolmaster than upon that of his higher priced but better-guarded quarry.

In the seventh year of William III., the Irish Protestant Parliament passed *An Act to Restrain Foreign Education.*[80] It contained, among others, the following provisions: Any person who sent a child abroad, or went abroad, to be trained in the Catholic religion, suffered forfeiture of all real and personal estate, was incapacitated from acting as guardian, executor, or administrator, from filling any public office, or from receiving any legacy or deed of gift. *Any common informer could set the law in motion, and recover half the forfeiture*, the other half going to the Crown. *The burden of proof of innocence was cast on the accused.* This provision was re-enacted by the *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 20. The Charter Schools were established by the

[76] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 148.

[77] *7 William III.*, cap. 4, sec. 9. The Irish Orangemen showed their sympathy with this Williamite Act by fiercely opposing Stanley's Irish Education Bill. See Killen's *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, ii., 456.

[78] *8 Anne*, c. 3, sec. 16.

[79] *Ibid.*, sec. 20.

[80] *7 William III.*, c. 4.

Protestant Primate, Boulter, in 1733. "These schools," says Lecky, "which were supported by the public funds, were avowedly intended for bringing up the young as Protestants, to extirpate the religion of their parents. The alternative offered by law to the Catholics was that of absolute and compulsory ignorance, or of an education directly subversive of their faith."[81]

HELOTS IN THEIR OWN LAND.

Public Representation, Public Employment, etc.—Referring to one of the earliest results of the Williamite victory, so sedulously commemorated by Orangemen, the Protestant historian, Walpole, writes: "The Government was now absolutely in the hands of the Protestant minority. . . . The English colony were the owners of nearly all the soil of the island; monopolised every office of trust and emolument."[82]

The Williamite English Act (*3 William and Mary*, c. 2) imposed on the members of both Irish Houses of Parliament (contrary to the Articles of Limerick) the oath of Abjuration of Popery, and a declaration against Transubstantiation. Catholics were thus excluded from both the Irish House of Lords and the House of Commons.[83] Atheists were not excluded by the Act.

No Catholic was allowed to vote at Parliamentary or Municipal elections.[84]

[81] Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 254, *sqq.* Killen says these schools were "essentially eleemosynary and proselytising," and that Catholic children "were transplanted to schools far away from their relations." *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, ii., 248. The Charter Schools were largely endowed. They were carried on by the Incorporated Society, who, in 1749, secured the passing of what has been termed the *Kidnapping Act*, which constituted them guardians of all begging children, with power to commit and convey them to the Charter schools (*The Endowed Schools Commission*, by Dean West, pp. 18-19. Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1882). Howard, the great philanthropist, made a visit of inspection to all the Charter schools, in 1784, and published such an unfavourable report of them that the Inspector-General of Prisons had an investigation made into their condition in 1786 and 1787. A Committee of Inquiry was appointed by the House of Commons, and they reported of the schools that "in many of the Charter schools, the clothing, cleanliness food, health and education of the children had been shamefully neglected." John Wesley also gives a sad picture of the ragged and filthy condition of the children in the Ballinrobe Charter School in 1785. There were only three beds for fifteen boys, and five for nineteen girls, and, as far as he could discover they were taught "*just nothing*." Wesley's *Journal*, p. 816. See also Steven's *Inquiry*, pp. 35-58, 60, 107.

[82] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. iv., pp. 331-332.

[83] *7 William III.*, c. 21; *9 William III.*, c. 9; *2 Anne*, c. 13; *6 Anne*, c. 11. Orangemen retained the declaration against Transubstantiation long after its administration had become illegal. See chap. vi., *supra*, p. 121.

[84] *2 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 24; *2 George I.*, c. 19, sec. 7; *7 George II.*, c. 9, sec. 7. Orangemen showed their sympathy with this measure by their

No Catholic could hold any office, civil or military, under the Crown. He could not be governor, head, or fellow of a university; nor barrister-at-law, attorney, or clerk in Chancery; nor professor of law, medicine, or any other science.[85] This was another of the Williamite laws by which the treaty of Limerick was violated. Another Williamite Act imposed a fine of £100 on any Catholic who would dare to act as solicitor in any court in the kingdom after the first of March, 1698.[86] *The fine was recoverable by any common informer.* By this Act, even if a Catholic barrister renounced his faith by taking the oath of Abjuration of Popery, etc., he was not permitted to practice, *unless he educated his children in the Protestant faith.* A supplemental Act of Queen Anne raised the penalty against Catholic barristers to £200;[87] while another section of the same statute prevented any attorney from employing a Catholic clerk. The Act of the first year of George II. was more sweeping still: It prohibited anyone practising as an attorney, etc., *unless he proved that he had been a Protestant for two years before applying to be called to the bar.*[88]

Catholics, says Lecky, were "deprived of the elective suffrage, excluded from the corporations, from the magistracy, from the bar, from the bench, from the grand juries, and from the vestries. They could not be sheriffs or solicitors, or even gamekeepers or constables. They were forbidden to possess any arms; two justices, or a mayor, or a sheriff, might at any time issue a search-warrant to break into their houses and ransack them for arms, and if a fowling-piece or a flask of powder was discovered, they were liable either to fine or imprisonment, or to whipping and the pillory. . . . In his own country the Catholic was only recognised by the law 'for repression and punishment.' The Lord Chancellor Bowes and the Chief Justice Robinson both distinctly laid down from the bench '*that the law does not suppose any such person to exist as an Irish Roman Catholic.*'"[89]

A SUMMARY VERDICT.

Such were the main provisions of the Irish Penal Code.

violent opposition to Parliamentary Reform and the Franchise Bill, as well as by their exclusion of Catholics from public life in Belfast and Derry. See their election rules, chap. vii., *supra*, pp. 135, *sqq.* See also Appendix A.

[85] *7 William III.*, c. 13; *2 Anne*, c. 6, sec. 16.

[86] *10 William III.*, c. 13.

[87] *6 Anne*, c. 6.

[88] *1 George II.*, c. 20, sec. 1.

[89] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 146. "The law did not suppose any such person to exist as an Irish Roman Catholic, nor could they breathe without the connivance of the Government." Bowes' words, quoted by Scully, *Statement of the Penal Laws*, p. 328

In the well-known words of Edmund Burke, "it was a complete system, full of coherence and consistency, well digested and well composed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." The Protestant historian, Walpole, says that the penal Acts of the reigns of William and of Anne "were of a character quite unparalleled."[90] Morrison Davidson, another Protestant writer, describes the Williamite anti-Catholic laws, under summary heads, as a war on property, "war on religion," "war on education," "war on marriage," and "war on commerce."[91] In his *Land War in Ireland* (p. 236), the Protestant writer Godkin thus refers to that inhuman Code: "The plan adopted for degrading the Catholics, and reducing all to one plebeian level, was most ingenious. The ingenuity, indeed, may be said to be Satanic, for it debased its victims morally as well as socially and physically. It worked by means of treachery, covetousness, perfidy, and the perversion of all natural affection. The trail of the serpent was over the whole system." According to Lecky the Irish Penal Code "was intended to degrade and to impoverish, to destroy in its victims the spring and buoyancy of enterprise, to dig a deep chasm between Catholics and Protestants. These ends it fully attained. . . . It was directed not against the few, but against the many. It was not the persecution of a sect, but the degradation of a nation. It was the instrument employed by a conquering race, supported by a neighbouring Power, to crush to the dust the people among whom they were planted."[92] In another work the same author writes: "It is impossible for any Irish Protestant, whose mind is not wholly perverted by religious bigotry, to look back without shame and indignation to the Penal Code."[93] Enlightened and liberal-minded Protestants deplore and condemn it quite as earnestly as Catholics do. But among those we cannot enumerate the members of the Orange society.

"The penal laws against the Roman Catholics," says Lecky, "both in England and Ireland, were the *immediate consequence of the Revolution*."[94] There are two results of the Revolution in Ireland which have ever been dear to the hearts

[90] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. vi., p. 332.
[91] *The Book of Erin*, pp. 172-176.
[92] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., pp. 169-170. See also Young's *Tour in Ireland*, vol. ii., sec. vii., pp. 59, *sqq.*, 271.
[93] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, p. 124.
[94] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 170.

of Orangemen, and which it is the main duty of their society to celebrate. They are :

1. The ascendency of their party, which was so ruthlessly exercised against the unhappy Catholics of Ireland ;

2. The defeat of the Catholic party, the "immediate consequence" of which was the persecution, plunder, and social and political degradation of the overwhelming mass of the Irish people.

Were it not for the anniversary celebrations of the Orange society, time would have mellowed the memory of those events, and the bitter feeling caused by close on a century of odious oppression would have, in due course, faded out of the Irish Catholic mind. Charity, patriotism, the spirit of religion, even the strong arm of British law, have all marked their stern disapprobation of those foolish and irritating displays of party vanity and sectarian hate. There are, however, certain circumstances which aggravate the folly of the Orange anniversary celebrations. They are :

1. The extreme offensiveness at all times, and, too frequently, the violent and sanguinary character, of these demonstrations. The Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the great Belfast riots of 1857, term the Orange celebrations "idle displays merely of offence.[95]" Orangemen, nevertheless, continue to persevere in them, without even the pretence of necessity, and in spite of, or rather because of, the known offensiveness of such displays to Catholics.

2. The Orange society was founded, and Orangemen long bound by oath, to maintain the hateful party ascendency that was inaugurated by the Williamite victory.

3. Orangemen have ever been, since 1795, the most violent and factious opponents of Emancipation, Reform, the Education, Franchise, and Disestablishment Bills, and, generally, of every measure intended to extend to Catholics even a modicum of natural and political right. An English Protestant historian, Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, writes of them as follows : "Every attempt made by English statesmen to apply to Ireland the most elementary principles of civil and religious liberty was encountered by these [Orange] societies with bitter hostility, and fresh insults on their Catholic compatriots."[96] Hundreds of petitions were sent to Parliament by the Orange party against the Emancipation Bill, and their opposition to the repeal of the Penal Code soon reached a state of frenzy bordering on open rebellion. "They were absolutely furious," says Molesworth, "and ready to ally themselves with any party

[95] *Report*, p. 15.
[96] *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 378.

who would assist them in defeating the measure and wrecking vengeance on its framers."[97] The wise and witty Sydney Smith thus refers to the violent opposition of the Orange faction to the repeal of penal legislation against their Catholic fellow-countrymen:

"In the name of Heaven, what are we to gain by suffering Ireland to be rode by that faction which now predominates over it? Why are we to endanger our own Church and State, not for 500,000 Episcopalians, but for ten or twelve great Orange families, who have been sucking the blood of that country for these hundred years last past? And the folly of the Orangemen in playing this game themselves is almost as absurd as ours in playing it for them. They ought to have the sense to see that their business now is to keep quietly the lands and beeves of which the fathers of the Catholics were robbed in days of yore; they must give to their descendants the sop of political power; by contending with them for names, they will lose realities, and be compelled to beg their potatoes in a foreign land, abhorred equally by the English who have witnessed their oppression, and by the Catholic Irish who have smarted under them."[98] Elsewhere in his writings the same witty divine thus refers to the disloyal threats which the Orange party habitually utter against the Crown and the Government whenever there is a question of repealing a penal enactment, or of enlarging the political rights of the Catholic body: "It is better to have four friends and one enemy than four enemies and one friend; and the more violent the hatred of the Orangemen, the more certain the reconciliation of the Catholics. The disaffection of the Orangemen will be the Irish rainbow; when I see it I shall be sure that the storm is over."[99]

4. The same spirit endures in the lodges to this day. While the world has been moving on, Orangemen still clothe themselves in the fierce spirit of the penal days; still frighten themselves with the same old bogies; still speak the antiquated language of the Williamite Code;[100] and—like a voice

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[98] *Peter Plymley's Letters*, Letter iii.

[99] *Ibid.*, Letter ix.

[100] Orangemen habitually use the offensive terms "Papist," "Popish," "Romish," and such-like theological slang. Elizabeth's *Injunctions* forbade the use of the word "Papist," as being offensive. Catholics, in the laws of her day, were termed "Recusants," or "persons in communion with the Church of Rome." In the days of William III., from 1692 onwards, and during the remainder of the penal times, the words "Papists," "Popish people," were used in the Statutes. The legal designation is now, and has long been, "Roman Catholics." Scully, *Penal Laws*, p. 1.

from the dead past—call, and ever call, for the imposition of legal disabilities against those who profess the Catholic creed. When we hear their "accredited organ," the *Victorian Standard*, refer in an editorial to "that fatal error, the Emancipation Act of 1829,"[101] we can understand the force of the rhetorical question of Lord Palmerston: "Is it an organisation which belongs to the age in which we live?"[102] To appreciate the value of the "equal civil and religious liberty," about which Orangemen talk so loudly as dating from the "glorious revolution," it is enough to remember that till 1870, it was a *crime, punishable by two years' imprisonment, or by a fine of £500, for a Catholic priest to celebrate a marriage between Catholics, if one of the contracting party had not been a Catholic for fully twelve months.* It cannot be urged that this was an obsolete penal statute. On the contrary, it was brought into force repeatedly. Several instances occur to my memory. The Rev. Patrick Campbell, Catholic curate of the Waterside, Derry, and subsequently professor of Theology in the Irish College, Paris, was brought up under this Act before Judge Torrens, at the Derry Assizes, somewhere in the fifties. He was defended by Mr. Thomas O'Hagan (afterwards Lord O'Hagan), whose speech did much to rivet attention on the iniquity of this statute. In the sixties, the celebrated Yelverton trial focussed the world's attention upon this infamous law. Soon after the Yelverton case a priest of the diocese of Clagher was tried before Judge Hayes, at the Enniskillen Assizes, *for the crime of having married two Catholics.* In April, 1866, Mr. Sergeant Armstrong, M.P. for Sligo, introduced a Bill to abolish the penalty; but it was only in 1870, when Mr. Gladstone was Premier, that the infamous law finally disappeared from the statute-book. Orangemen still carry on a bitter, energising, far-reaching, and generally secret crusade, not alone against the Catholic body, but against their noblest charitable movements, and against individual members of the hated creed. Many of my readers will recall the violent antagonism of the Irish brethren to the spread of Father Mathew's great temperance movement in Ulster; their screaming harangues; their anti-temperance riots, especially at Lurgan and Newtownhamilton; and the resolution of the Loughgall Orange farmers not to employ any labourer who would dare to pledge himself to sobriety at the preaching of a Catholic priest.[103] Their system

[101] *Victorian Standard*, May, 1893, p. 6, first column.

[102] In his reply to a deputation of Ulster Orangemen, February 18, 1858. See chapter xiv., *infra.*

[103] W. J. O'Neill Daunt, *Eighty-five Years of Irish History*, pp. 200-201

of exclusive dealing loads the dice, to some extent, against Catholics engaged in business pursuits. On their platform, in their press, and in the secret of their lodges, they raise objections to the presence of Catholics in the Civil Service.[104] They use the franchise and the Ballot Act as engines to keep Catholics out of Parliamentary and Municipal bodies.[105] To this day the two great Orange centres of Ulster prove how deeply the fraternity are in sympathy with many of the provisions of the Irish Penal Code—the Catholic majority of Derry, and the Catholic minority of Belfast having been almost to this hour systematically excluded from practically any share in offices of honour and emolument in the gift of the local public bodies.[106] The regrettable character of the language constantly employed at Orange demonstrations has been sufficiently dealt with in the last chapter. The tenth, eleventh, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters will serve to point out other well-known facts and features of the Orange organisation, which contribute additional elements of offensiveness to these unnecessary displays, and make them, in a way, as direct incitements to riot and disorder as the fabled trailing of coat-tails at Donnybrook fair.

The Cootehill Orangemen issued a manifesto against the Father Mathew's advent in Ulster: "Insulted Protestants! will ye, can ye, bear it any longer?" etc. It called on the sons of William to "let not the anti-Christian apostle depart from Cootehill in boasted triumph." *Ibid.*

[104]See chap. viii. *supra.*

[105]See chap. vii., p. 135, *sqq.*

[106]See Appendix A, *infra.*

Chapter X.

ORANGE DEMONSTRATIONS: THE THEATRICAL DISPLAY AND ITS METHODS—ROVING AGITATORS: THEIR WORDS AND THEIR WAYS—WHAT DOES "LOYALTY" MEAN?—THE MARCH PAST: GUNS, BAYONETS, "SACKFULS OF REVOLVERS," BROKEN HEADS, AND OTHER VALUABLE PROPERTY—SNIFFING THE ODOUR OF BATTLE.

On the 10th of July, 1836, a high-minded and distinguished English Protestant, Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary for Ireland, said in the course of a letter to his mother: "I am very busy with the arrangements for the 12th of July—the day on which the *Orange demons walk*. It is very difficult to allay their fiendish spirit."[1] He was preparing at the time for the illegal Orange processions which were to take place two days later throughout Ulster, in defiance of the provisions of the Party Processions Act of 1832. Processions, with their party emblems, party tunes and cries, etc., constitute what has been termed, in a previous chapter, the theatrical portion of the Orange demonstrations. To the average member of the lodge they are as the apple of his eye. The true "sons of William" under the Southern Cross look forward to the day when the streets of our Australasian cities and towns may witness as brave a show as the brethren of the far North make each succeeding July in Derry or Belfast or Toronto. This phase of the Orange demonstration deserves attention, for the following reasons:

(*a*) Because the methods adopted in these displays afford a good insight into the spirit and policy of the institution.

(*b*) Because of the calamitous results which have followed in the wake of these processions, from the inception of Orangeism down to the present day.

To estimate the effect which the introduction of such processions would have upon the peace of the Australian colonies if Orangeism ever became a power in our midst, we

[1] *Thomas Drummond*, by Barry O'Brien. Drummond was an officer of engineers on the Irish Ordnance Survey, 1824-1830. He knew Ireland well, having studied its people, its history, and its politics on the spot.

must first consider the part they have played in the history of Ulster, the cradle and home of the institution. The Orange portions of that province have long enjoyed the unenviable notoriety of being the only parts of Ireland where sectarian riots are chronic; where violence, bloodshed, pillage, and wreckings are inflicted upon the members of a religious denomination who are in a minority. There alone we witness what a former Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, termed "the annual specimen of civil war."[2] Ulster has the singular distinction of being the only place in Ireland where Royal Commissions have sat to inquire into religious riots. It is to that province, and to it alone, that large bodies of police and military have to be drafted, at enormous expense to the ratepayers, when each circling year brings back its anniversary of the "glorious, pious, and immortal memory." "The 12th of July," says the *Report* of the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857, "has always brought with it its Orange gatherings, its party displays, its consequent riots." Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Chief Secretary for Ireland, in opposing the repeal of the Party Processions Act, July 12, 1870, said: "The strange (he was going to say the scandalous) spectacle still continued, that Government, at this time of day, should find it necessary, summer after summer, to send down a large force of military and police to a flourishing, happy, and prosperous part of the country, for the purpose of keeping the peace between the two religious parties there."[3]

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER.

What is the cause of all this? Parliamentary Committees, Royal Commissions, Protestant statesmen, judges, etc., have, with singular unanimity, attributed this distressful state of Ulster to the party processions of the Orange institution. The *Belfast News-Letter* of July 13th, 1813, speaks in condemnation of those "idle parades having enkindled those animosities and heartburnings which should have for ever sunk into oblivion." In October, 1830, the Orange Grand Committee (Dublin) consulted the two eminent barristers, Mr. Sergeant Pennefather and Mr. Holmes, both of whom expressed their decided opinion that even then, before any Party Processions Act had been passed, "under existing circumstances, and the present state of the law, Orange processions are not only decidedly *illegal, but dangerous*."[4] Mr. Stanley, in moving his

[2] In the House of Commons, 14th March, 1870. Hansard of date, p. 1888.

[3] Hansard, vol. cciii., Third Series, col. 166.

[4] Given in *Report* of Parliamentary Select Committee (English) of 1835.

Processions Act in 1832, said that the reason why it was directed against the Orange party was that they *alone* persevered in endeavouring to keep alive religious animosity, which had led to so many fatal consequences.[5] Mr. Christie, whose testimony has been so often quoted in these pages, declared before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835: "There scarcely has been a 12th of July, to the best of my recollection, in any year from the commencement of Orangeism [1795] till the present period [1835], when a breach of the peace has not occurred, and frequently lives have been lost, in consequence of these processions."[6] William Stratton, an Ulster Protestant constable, examined before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, was of opinion that the country would be very quiet but for Orange processions and drum-beatings, which were the natural results of the institution, and which were calculated to give offence to Catholics. The Right Hon. the Earl of Caledon (a Protestant, and Lieutenant of Tyrone county) was asked by the Committee: "What is your lordship's opinion as to the effect of these processions, and drum-beatings, and party tunes, as it affects the peace of the country?" Lord Caledon replied: "I think the processions are very mischievous."[7] In reply to another question, he declared that whatever would prevent party processions would be an advantage to the public peace.[8] Sir Frederick Stoven, Inspector-General of Police, and likewise a Protestant, said before the same Committee that Orange processions and drum-beatings were calculated to insult Catholics,[9] and that if Orangemen would only refrain from their processions, etc., religious dissension would cease in the community.[10] Messrs. Richardson Bell, W. J. Handcock, J.P., Randall, Kernan, Captain Duff, and many other witnesses examined, all condemned the Orange society as promoting lawlessness and animosity, and leading to outrage and bloodshed.

The Parliamentary Committee (English) of the House of Commons (1835), said in their *Report*: "The obvious tendency and effect of the Orange society is to keep up an exclusive society in civil and military life, exciting one portion of the people against the other; to increase the rancour and animosity too often, unfortunately, existing between different religious persuasions . . . by processions on particular days, attended with the insignia of the society, to excite to breaches of the

[5] *Parl. Debates* vol. xiii., p. 1035.
[6] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parliamentary *Report* of 1835, Qq. 5600, 5634.
[7] *Ibid.*, Q. 5473.
[8] *Ibid.*, Q. 5538; cf. Q. 5418.
[9] *Ibid.*, Q. 4651.
[10] *Ibid.*, Qq. 4700, 4703.

peace and to bloodshed," etc. The *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1886, commenting on the evidence brought before the Parliamentary Committees of the previous year, makes the following charge (among others) against the Orange society: "That, by its annual processions and commemorations of epochs of party triumph, it has exasperated and transmitted ancient feuds, which have led to riots, with loss of property and life."

The Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the great Belfast riots of 1857 say in their *Report*: "The Orange system seems to us now to have no other practical result than as a means of keeping up the Orange festivals and celebrating them; *leading, as they do, to violence, outrage, religious animosities, hatred between classes, and too often bloodshed and loss of life.* These opinions have been forced from us, and in giving them we feel a hope that when the kindly and generous minds belonging to the Orange society *see the results attending their organisation*—so different from what they intended—they will think that it is well to consider whether there is any controlling necessity to keep it alive, *notwithstanding the evils that, unfortunately, attend its existence.*"[11] Elsewhere in their *Report* the Commissioners say that the "happening of outrages at that period [July 12] was a matter of usual occurrence,"[12] and add these emphatic words: "*The celebration of that festival* [July 12] *by the Orange party in Belfast is plainly and unmistakably the originating cause of these riots.*" And again: "As long as this festival continues to be celebrated, it is essential, for the sake of peace and order, that the arm of the Executive Government in Belfast shall be strengthened, and a force kept up sufficient to at once put down outrage on all sides."[13] In his evidence before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, the distinguished Presbyterian journalist, Dr. James McKnight, said of the people of Ulster that "if their ill passions were not stirred up by those historic memories, and displays connected with them, they would live on perfectly good terms."[14]

Lord Chancellor Brady, in his noted document of October 6, 1857, on Orange magistrates, declares that the party feeling so prevalent in Belfast was "excited on the recurrence of certain anniversaries, which for years have been made the occasion of irritating demonstrations, too often attended by violations of the public peace, and dangerous, and sometimes fatal, conflicts. *The Orange society is mainly instrumental in*

[11] *Report*, p. 11.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[14] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5379.

keeping up this excitement . . . . It is manifest that the existence of this society, and the conduct of many of those who belong to it, tend to keep up, through large districts of the North, a spirit of bitter and factious hostility among large classes of her Majesty's subjects, and to provoke violent animosity and aggression."[15]

The *Report* of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Derry disturbances of 1883, said: "It must be admitted the professed aim of the Apprentice Boys' society involves some danger to the peace of Londonderry."[16] The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the great Belfast riots of 1886 said in its *Report* that the Orange celebrations "are a fruitful cause of rioting and disturbance;" and they recommend the conferring on magistrates of a summary power to prevent all processions of a kind calculated to bring about a breach of the peace.[17]

[15] The letter was published in the *Northern Whig*, October, 1857. See chap. xiv., *infra*.

[16] *Report*, p. x. The Apprentice Boys of Derry are practically at one with the members of the Orange association. They have the same general organisation, the same aims and methods, the same deep and active hatred of their Catholic fellow-citizens. Large numbers of Orangemen join in their processions, and otherwise associate with them in furthering the purposes which the two associations—or, rather, the two phases of the same association—hold in common. The rules of the Apprentice Boys, and evidence of their intercourse with the Orange society, will be found in the *Reports, Minutes of Evidence*, and Appendices to *Reports* of the Derry Royal Commissions of 1869 and 1883. The history of Apprentice-Boyism, like that of Orangeism, is stained with blood. The *Reports* of the Royal Commissions held in Derry tell us only of a few crimes of the "Boys." The files of the *Derry Journal* (Catholic) and the *Derry Standard* (Presbyterian) supply what the *Reports* omit. I select the following typical proofs of the goodwill of the "Apprentices" to their Catholic fellow-citizens: (1) Loosening large coping stones on the city wall, in anticipation of a torchlight procession of Catholics passing underneath the same night. This occurred after an election petition, which the presiding judge had decided in favour of Mr. Dowse, a liberal Protestant. (2) Placing a large vessel, filled with gun powder and broken bottles, on the route of a Catholic procession 17th March, 1878, with a fuse attached, and the explosion timed for the procession passing. (3) Throwing a bomb through the window on the roof of a hall where Catholics were holding a ball, 17th March, 1879, with the result that a girl was maimed for life. The perpetrators of these outrages were, in each case, allowed to go scot free, the magistrates having made no attempt to bring them to justice. The contempt of the "Boys" for authority, both civil and ecclesiastical, has been very marked. The Government prohibited their demonstration 18th December, 1869, and proclaimed the city The "Apprentices," nevertheless, tried to carry out their customary procession, and discharged ordnance from the tower of the Protestant Cathedral. The respected Protestant Bishop of Derry, Dr. Higgin, forbade the display of party flags from his cathedral, 12th August, 1860, when Catholics were so deeply roused over the Derrymacash murders the twelfth of July previous. The "Boys" replaced with violence the flags which the courageous Bishop had ordered to be taken down.

[17] *Report*, p. 16.

An Orange testimony may not be amiss here. Mr. Johnston, of Ballykillbeg, said, in the debate on the repeal of the Party Processions Act in 1870, that he "did not maintain that Orange demonstrations were a means of preserving the peace."[18] When the Irish Grand lodge found that things had gone too far in 1830, in its address of 26th June of that year it recommended abstention, because "the public processions were likely to lead to a great loss of life, and prove injurious to the Orange association," and might, "in all likelihood, be made the groundwork of some legislative enactment for the suppression of the Orange society."[19] The Grand Lodge took no action in the matter until the very existence of the society was imperilled by the violence of its associates.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF STRIFE.

There are three features in connection with the typical Orange processions, as carried out in Ulster, which, taken together, constitute a serious menace to public tranquility. They are:

1. The gathering together of large bodies of men, chiefly of the lower orders, by command of the lodges.

2. These bodies of people are usually wrought to a high pitch of excitement by inflammatory discourses.

3. A portion of them, at least, are usually armed with deadly weapons.

1. The *Report* of the Select Parliamentary Committee (English) of 1835 on Orange lodges says: "The power of calling out all lodges rests with the Grand Master and his Deputy, on the application of twelve members of the Grand Committee; the same person, the Grand Master of Ireland and England, having the same powers, which are stated to be uncontrollable and arbitrary, of bringing together large bodies of armed aud unarmed men, to make a demonstration of physical force which might prove highly dangerous." During the early thirties, the correspondence of the Imperial Grand Lodge of London lingers frequently on the recognised Orange policy of physical force.[20] I have already quoted Fairman's letter in point to the Duke of Gordon, Deputy Grand Master for Scotland,[21] and Deputy Grand Master Plunket's correspondence with Fairman.[22] The *Dublin University Magazine*

[18]House of Commons, 30th March, 1870. Hansard of date, col. 941.

[19]Appendix to *Report* of Parl. Committee, 1835.

[20]See Fairman Letters in *Report* and Appendix; also, in Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond.*

[21]See p. 3, *supra.*

[22]*Ibid.*

(an Orange organ) for April, 1836, said: "The organisation of Orangeism was designed simply for the concentration of physical force."[23] The sixth of the Secret Articles of 1799 bound every Orangeman to "appear in ten hours' warning."[24] According to the books of the Grand Lodge for June, 1835, large bodies of people had assembled in various parts of Ireland at the word of command, as many as 75,000 having come together at Hillsborough alone.[25] Reference has already been made to the vast numbers of Orangemen who were at the beck and call of the Imperial Grand Master in the thirties,"[26] and to the statements made in the *Report* of the English Select Committee as to how dangerous such a society "might become under possible circumstances of the country." The Royal Commission of 1869 refers in warning tones to the danger of "concentrating in Londonderry bodies of partisans from considerable distances."[27]

ROVING AGITATORS.

2. The danger to the public peace from Orange processions is notably increased by the fact that the large masses of the lower orders of the people, brought together at these demonstrations, have their feelings wrought up to a fine fury against the Catholic body by what the *Times* terms the "inflammatory addresses of roving agitators."[28] In the eighth chapter of this volume reference has been made to a peculiarly distressing feature of this bad business, namely: that the most delirious of those dangerous zealots are almost invariably clergymen, whose platform utterances are strangely inconsistent, not merely with their sacred calling, but with the elemental duty of loyal citizens. 'Twas ever thus, from the days of Rev. Mr. Mansell's fervid oratory in 1795. During the debate of March 23, 1835, on Orange lodges, Mr. Finn, M.P., quoted some remarkable extracts from the inflammatory speeches of Rev. "Johnny" McCrea, Chaplain and laureate of the Irish Grand Lodge. In one of these speeches he practically urged the destruction of the Catholic churches in Dublin city.[29] A peculiarly outrageous

[23] Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 222.

[24] Appendix to Parl. *Report*, 1835.

[25] Parl. *Report* (English).

[26] See p. 45, *supra*.

[27] *Report*, p. 17. Considerable bodies of Orangemen from the country attended the procession held at Brunswick (Melbourne), July 19, 1897.

[28] *Times*, 16th August, 1870.

[29] Rev. Mr. McCrea was enraged at the number of Catholic churches then being built in Dublin, and suggested, in the words of Knox, that "to banish the crows, they should pull down their nests." He pledged himself to "raise such a spirit that no power in earth or in hell can resist it. *Every Popish altar must be pulled down*, every Popish priest must be banished . . . *or fall a victim to the righteous indignation* of the people," etc.

attack of his on the Catholic body, in the Dublin Royal Exchange (1835), so won the admiration of the Grand Lodge that they presented him with a service of plate.[30] Mr. James Sinclair, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, deposed before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that some clergymen—principally curates and rectors—of the Protestant Church, "very violently" encouraged party animosity between Catholics and Protestants, for their own ends.[31] Grand Chaplain Drew was another militant cleric, somewhat after the type of Rev. "Johnny" McCrea. The Belfast Riots Commissioners of 1857 strongly condemn him for having preached a singularly acrimonious sermon "to a large congregation assembled for religious worship, containing denunciations of a large class of his fellow men."[32] The same Royal Commissioners likewise condemn the offensive and "disturbing placards" addressed to the Catholic body during the progress of the riots by Rev. Mr. McIlwine, and the inflammatory utterances of Rev. H. Hanna to the excited Orange proletariat of Belfast. "Out of conflict our rights arose," said Mr. Hanna, "and by conflict they ought to be maintained."[33] Such language, to such people, at such a time and place, was as the dropping of a spark into a powder magazine. It had its acknowledged share in intensifying and prolonging the scenes of riot, plunder, bloodshed, and confusion which focussed the astonished eyes of British civilisation on Belfast in 1857. The Royal Commissioners of Inquiry throw serious blame on the intemperate utterances of one of the Orange clergy, but for whom, they say in their *Report* "matters might have easily passed off without further trouble."

Readers of a still later period of Irish history will recall with a smile the bellicose utterances of reverend Orange orators during the Disestablishment agitation in 1868 and 1869; of Revs. Mr. Flanagan, W. H. Ferrar, T. Ellis, John Nash Griffin, H. Henderson, L. Canter, C. Maginnis, and a score of others whose names are lost to fame.[34] The fervid appeals made by another clergyman to the passions of an Orange audience at Rosslea (Monaghan), during the Home Rule agita-

---

[30] Cf. *Report* of Irish Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835, Appendix x., p. 77.

[31] *Minutes of Evidence*, *Report* of Parl. Committee, Qq. 5014, 5015.

[32] *Report*. The sermon referred to is given in Appendix to *Report*. Grand Chaplain Drew was the author of the tract *Twenty Reasons for being an Orangeman*, referred to near the close of chap. viii., *supra*.

[33] *Ibid.*, and Appendix.

[34] A highly entertaining series of extracts from the Orange speeches of that period—copied mostly from the chief Irish mouthpiece of the Orange party, the *Daily Express*—is given in *The Orange Bogey*, by J. J. Clancy, M.A., M.P. (Irish Press Agency publications, No. 2, 1886).

tion, will be readily recalled by those of my readers who are acquainted with the events of the period.[35] From the eighth chapter of this book the reader can form an idea of the spirit of fierce animosity towards Catholics which animates the Orange clergy in Australia.

KEEPING THEIR POWDER DRY.

3. In a passage of his *Personal Sketches*, already quoted, Sir Jonah Barrington, who was an Orangeman as early as 1798, remarked that William of Orange ought to be a singularly proud ghost—so many heads having been broken in his honour. Orangemen contribute materially to this result by the offensive character of their demonstrations, and by their old-standing habit of carrying arms on the celebration of their anniversaries. In the good old days of the Orange yeomanry their favourite weapons were the muskets and bayonets supplied them by the Government. Sir Frederick Stoven, Inspector-General of Police, declared to the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that for the past ten years the yeomanry were "quite useless, and more than useless in my opinion; I think they are dangerous."[36] Other witnesses gave expression to the same opinion.[37] The English Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges, on page xxvii. of their *Report*, warn the Government of the urgent danger of large bodies of armed men being concentrated at a given spot, at the beck of a Master of a lodge, and call for the immediate suppression of the society.

The idea of *gun-clubs* originated with the Orangemen during the No-Popery fury which seized upon the Irish lodges after the passing of the Emancipation Bill in 1829. At the Armagh court-house, December 28, 1831, Viscount Mandeville spoke to the brethren there assembled, of the necessity of arming themselves to resist the encroachments of Popery. He added: "You have your watch and clock clubs; *why not have your gun-clubs as well*?" Mr. W. Stratton, an Ulster Protestant police-constable, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee (Irish), directly attributes the formation of gun-clubs to this speech.[38] At this time, said the same witness, there were no Catholic gun-clubs in existence.[39] Sir F. Stoven was asked: "Are the majority of the gun-clubs Protestant?" He

[35] The Rev. orator made a violent attack on Mr. Biggar, M.P., and Home Rulers generally, amid Orange cries of "shoot Biggar," "shoot them," "we'll shoot them." *Freeman's Journal*, October 17, 1883.

[36] *Report, Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 4778.

[37] *Ibid.*, Qq. 4211-4212, 7315-7317, 8799. At the time the yeomanry were nearly all Orangemen. See Qq. 4340, 4341, 4550, 5349, 5628-5630, 9386.

[38] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 5189, *sqq.*, 5218, 5235.

[39] *Ibid.*, Qq. 5330-5331.

replied: "As far as I have heard, they are. I have heard that a great number of the landlords of the highest class are encouraging their tenantry to arm."[40] Lord Gosford gave evidence before the Select Committee showing that these gun-clubs existed to an alarming extent in Ulster shortly after Lord Mandeville's speech at Armagh.

Mr. Sinclair, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, testified as follows before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835:[41]

"Who are more armed, the Catholics or the Orangemen? The Catholics are never armed with deadly weapons.

"Are the Orangemen frequently armed? Yes, constantly."

Before the same Committee, our old friend Mr. Christie, an Ulster Quaker, deposed that "the Orangemen always had muskets and side-arms and pistols."[42]

A great number of firearms were distributed among the Orange processionists who, after the famine years, took part in the massacre of Catholics and the burning of their houses at Dolly's Brae.

The Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Derry disturbances of 1869 say in their *Report* that, during these processions, "the disposition to use firearms becomes general. One of the witnesses said: 'Every person who can muster arms on that day carries them.'" During the debate on the repeal of the Party Processions Act (30th March, 1870) Mr. Callan, M.P., a Louth man himself, living on the borders of Ulster, strongly objected to the firing parties at Orange processions.[43] The Orange hero, Mr. Johnston, however, stoutly opposed the insertion of a clause in the proposed Government Bill rendering it penal to carry firearms in a procession.[44] In the south of Ireland, as Mr. M'Carthy Downing pointed out, no weapons are carried in processions.[45] Part of the Derry celebrations consist of the firing of cannon *from the bastion which overlooks the Catholic portion of the town*.[46] County Inspector Stafford (a Protestant) deposed before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, that a number of cannon in the Apprentice Boys' gun-room on this bastion were in charge of a body of drunken men, and loaded with pounded jars, ready to be

[40] *Ibid.*, Q. 4545.

[41] *Ibid.*, Qq. 5055-5056.

[42] *Ibid.*, Q. 3635.

[43] Hansard, vol. ii. of Session, p. 957.

[44] Hansard, vol. ccii., Third Series, p. 1682 (July 7, 1870).

[45] Hansard, vol. ii. of Session, p. 954 (30th March, 1870).

[46] *Report*, Derry Royal Commission of 1869, p. 10. Dr. James McKnight, in his evidence before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, strongly objected to the selection of this portion of the city walls for the purpose of "firing in practical triumph over the heads and houses of these people" [the Catholics]. *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5330.

brought out to fire on the Catholic party passing underneath on the night of Mr. Dowse's return for the city, in November, 1868.[47]

During the Home Rule agitation in the eighties, Irish Orangemen were, according to their organ, the *Daily Express*, recommended, when going to demonstrations and counter-demonstrations, to bring with them "their *sweethearts and plenty of stuff*"—in plain English, revolvers and ammunition.[48] At Lord Rossmore's reception, in Monaghan, in December, 1883, one of the prominent speakers made use of the following pregnant words: "Let there be no revolver practice. (Cheers.) His advice to them about revolvers was: Never to use a revolver except they were firing at someone. (Laughter and cheers.) Firing squibs in the air was nothing."[49] On the 16th of October, in the same year, a peaceable and legal meeting of Nationalists was held at Rosslea, in a parish where the Catholics numbered 4,394 out of a total population of 6,069. The Orange party organised a counter-demonstration, and came provided with an abundance of both "sweethearts" and "stuff." They assembled near the spot where the Nationalist meeting was in progress. Their organ, the *Daily Express*, of the following day describes how, at one part of the proceedings, "hundreds of revolvers were produced throughout the [Orange] gathering, and it is no exaggeration to say that the firing became general. For fully ten minutes it was steadily maintained, notwithstanding the efforts of the leaders to stop it."[50] The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* of the same date states that the revolver practice of the Orange party was directed "towards the hill where the Nationalist meeting was being held."

Mr. Trevelyan, Chief Secretary for Ireland, thus described, in the House of Commons, the Orange counter-demonstrations of the 80's: "Unfortunately, however, the counter-demonstrations of the Orangemen were, to a great extent, demonstrations of *bodies of armed men*. At their last meeting at Dromore *sackfuls of revolvers were left behind close to the place of meeting*. The reason that they were so left was that a shrewd and energetic officer who was present was seen to search the Orangemen as they came along. The Orange meetings, therefore, were *bodies of armed men, many of whom came prepared to use their arms;* some of them prepared to make a murderous attack upon the Nation-

[47] *Minutes of Evidence*, pp. 73, 74.
[48] *Daily Express*, November 6, 1883, in report of an Orange demonstration held in Pettigo on the previous day.
[49] *Daily Express*, December 8, 1883.
[50] *Ibid.*, October 17, 1883.

alists. So far as the Government knew, it was not the custom of the Nationalists to go armed to their meetings until the bad example was set by the Orangemen."[51] In connection with the death of the unfortunate Orange lad Giffen, who was shot during the riot, evidence was adduced to show that many of the brethren who attended this demonstration were paid 7s. 6d. each, besides receiving return tickets, and being supplied with revolvers. In 1884 the Master of the Dyan Lodge issued "A Scheme for the better Organisation of the Orange Society as a fighting Force." It was, in effect, a revival of the gun club idea of 1831. He suggested the formation of a picked body of men, accustomed, where possible, to military discipline. They were to be armed with Snider rifles; "the arms to be kept in a depôt (the nearest Orange hall), or some sufficiently strong place to ensure their safety;" the District Council to meet monthly, inspect the weapons, "distribute ammunition," etc.[52]

The carrying of deadly weapons has been, ever since 1795, and continues to be until the present day, a feature of Orange processions in Ireland. The *Derry Journal* of July 3, 1896, and the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* report a tragic incident which resulted from the preparations for an L.O.L. demonstration in "ould Donegal." "The Orangemen of the district," says the first-named paper, "were arranging for a display through Mountcharles on the 12th." A number of the brethren went into the town of Donegal for the purpose of "making arrangements for the coming Orange celebrations." An important part of these "arrangements" seems to have consisted of loaded revolvers. One of these, through being incautiously handled, went off. The contents of one of the chambers shattered the hand of one of the fraternity, named Galbraith, and then lodged in the head of one Cassidy, Master of the Doorin-road lodge, killing him almost immediately.

In the Orange procession there are, then, three elements, which, when combined, constitute a serious menace to public tranquility. These are: (*a*) A large assemblage of people, composed mainly of the lower and less educated portion of the community;[53] (*b*) this assemblage of people usually aroused by inflammatory harangue to hatred or fury against their

[51] Hansard, vol. cclxxxiv., p. 383.

[52] This "scheme" was published in the *Freeman's Journal*, with the writer's name given in full. Imperial Grand Master, the Earl of Enniskillen, wrote to the same paper a letter bearing date January 1st, 1884, admitting that the document, in his opinion, contained "proposals of an illegal character," but adding that "the responsibility for the suggestions contained therein . . . rests with its author."

[53] *Report*, Belfast Royal Commission of 1857, pp. 8, 9.

Catholic neighbours; and (*c*) many of them carrying deadly weapons.

"AIDING THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES."

It requires but little knowledge of human nature to foretell the probable behaviour of such an assemblage under such circumstances. It will be sufficient to point out three direct or indirect results of their action, which should deserve the attention of every person who loves the reign of peace and good-will among men. These are:

1. Holding of processions in defiance of the laws of the land, and of the forces of the Crown.

2. Riot, bloodshed, destruction of property, and loss of life.

3. The formation of counter-associations by Catholics in self-defence.

The two last-mentioned effects of Orange demonstrations will form the subject of the next chapter.

1. We are all familiar with the way in which Orangemen boast of their loyalty to the Throne, and their undeviating fidelity and entire subjection to the law. Their actions, in this as in other particulars, are a curious commentary on their professions. The Orange society has, down the course of its history, persisted in holding its processions after they had been

(*a*) Condemned by Parliament;

(*b*) Declared illegal at common law, and forbidden by mayors, magistrates, Lords Lieutenant, etc.;

(*c*) Made doubly illegal by the Anti-processions Acts of 1832, 1850, and 1860.

(*a*) The Parliamentary Debates of 1813, 1814, 1815, 1823, 1824, and 1825 on the Orange society, arose mainly out of the outrages, uproar, and confusion attending L.O.L. demonstrations. In the debate of 29th June, 1813, Canning said he "thought that it was consoling to reflect that . . . no one had branched into any such anomaly as to stand up in defence of the innocence of the Orange institution, nor had anyone denied that those who entered into its full design were guilty of an attempt against the peace of the Empire." Similar condemnations were passed upon it in the following year (18th July, 1814), during the debate on Sir Henry Parnell's notice of motion; again on 4th July, 1815, when he moved for a Commission of Inquiry into Orangeism in the North of Ireland; and subsequently in the debates of 5th March, 1823, of 1824, and of the following year, when, principally because of the outrages attending its processions, the Irish institution was suppressed by Act of Parliament.[54]

[54] *Journals of the House of Commons; History of Orangeism*, by "M.P.", p. 182.

(*b*) Orange processions were frequently declared illegal at common law. One of the weightiest of the pronouncements on the subject was uttered by Baron Dowse, a Protestant, at the Belfast Winter Assizes, December 4, 1883. It is reported as follows in the columns of the *Daily Express*, the chief organ of the Irish Orange party:

"It was needless for him to tell them that illegal assemblies were breaches of the common law. The law on the point was well settled. Nothing could be clearer or more distinct, but he was sorry to say that many people seemed to be ignorant of it. Recently, as judge of the Exchequer Division, he had had an opportunity of considering that law in connection with the Lord Chief Baron and his late brother, Baron Fitzgerald—who, he was glad to say, was only 'late' in the sense that he was no longer on the bench—and they had gone over the whole law in connection with illegal assemblies in this country. That was in the case of O'Kelly *v.* Rodolphus Harvey, in which the Court of Exchequer decided that the magistrate was justified in the action he took, and he believed he was correct in saying that the decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal. He did not say there was anything important in that decision in his being a party to it himself, but it brought vividly before his mind the law as it was, and as it had been, and as he hoped it would continue to be. The law was laid down then by all the judges of the Court of Exchequer, assisted by the wisdom and experience of, probably, the most learned jurist that ever sat upon the bench—the late Baron Fitzgerald. The law was laid down in every book of authority on the subject. In the well-known book of the late Justice Hayes, it was laid down in these terms: 'Any meeting of two or more persons, which, from its character, and the circumstances under which it is assembled, is likely, in the opinion of men of reasonable firmness and courage, to prove dangerous to the peace of the neighbourhood, or calculated to excite terror, alarm, or consternation, is an unlawful assembly.' Being an unlawful assembly, every one who takes part in it—not as an ordinary spectator, but every one who is a member of it—is guilty of taking part in an unlawful assembly, which is a misdemeanour at common law, and may be punished by fine or imprisonment."

Neither the illegality of Orange processions in Ireland, nor the proclamations issued against them from time to time, seem to have exercised any restraining influence on the official conduct of the organisation which professes to place loyalty in the very forefront of its motives of action. This will appear from

the following particulars, which have been taken more or less at random from among many such that appear in the *Reports* of the Parliamentary Select Committees of Inquiry into the Orange society:[55]

In 1819 the Orangemen of Liverpool held a procession in spite of a proclamation by the mayor and magistrates. Subscriptions were subsequently raised in the English lodges to prosecute the mayor and magistrates for having interrupted the processions in the interests of public peace. In 1829 the Marquis of Donegal and the magistrates of Belfast forbade the holding of Orange processions in that city. The brethren defied the prohibition, and walked in procession as usual. In consequence of the violence of the brethren at the Emancipation of the Catholics in 1829, processions were forbidden in the North of Ireland by proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, the Duke of Northumberland. The proclamation was defied. On the 13th July processions were held as usual, and the province of Ulster was from end to end one scene of bloodshed and confusion. In 1830 Grand Master the Duke of Cumberland had ordered processions. Orangemen in Ulster obeyed the Grand Master. The law was set at defiance all over the province. Sharman Crawford tried to stop one of those illegal displays. He and his forces were defeated by the armed brethren. At Maghery they defied the Riot Act, and later on (if my memory of the evidence serves me right) broke open a gaol and released the prisoners. The following year processions were again proclaimed, with the usual result: The official returns published by the police authorities[56] showed that in the province of Ulster alone there were not fewer than fifty Orange processions, representing in each case attendances of from 1,000 to 50,000 persons, headed and countenanced by Orangemen in high civil station and authority, as well as by members of the Irish Grand Lodge. The next year (1832) processions were held all over Ulster, headed occasionally by magistrates and by yeomanry officers (contrary to military regulations), as many as 8,000 to 9,000 men, with 40 bands and 250 muskets, marching at Dungannon under the leadership of one so high in the society as our old friend Lieutenant-Colonel Verner.[57]

The Quaker witness, Mr. Christie, testified before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that, when Orangemen were

---

[55] See *Reports*, Appendices to *Reports*, and *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 3476, *sqq.*, 3613, 4313, 4466, 4572-4580, 6088-6212, 7830, 8070, 8825, 8829-8833, etc Appendices C6, pp. 90-124.

[56] In Appendix C4 *a.* to Parliamentary *Report* (Irish), pp. 98-99.

[57] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 7864 *sqq.*

prosecuted and fined for marching in illegal processions, the fines were paid by collections taken up in the lodges, and that on one occasion the name of a County Down magistrate figured on a subscription list of this nature (Qq. 5674-6). According to the *Report* of the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, the Grand Lodge, at its meeting of February 29, 1832, voted £20, and subsequently other sums to the amount of over £125, for the defence of the lawbreakers.[58] Sir Frederick Stoven, Inspector-General of Police, detailed before the Committee how his men had been hooted by the Orange processionists for having faithfully performed their task, and that he had received the greatest resistance from Orangemen in the discharge of his duty.[59] Captain Duff, another Protestant witness, gave similar evidence,[60] and Lord Gosford deposed: "In the discharge of my duty as lieutenant of the county Armagh, I have found bodies of them [Orangemen] resist the law. . . I have found them resist the law, and refuse to obey the law as Orangemen."

(*c*) *Statute Law.*—The Irish Orange Institution was, as stated, suppressed by Act of Parliament in 1825, chiefly because of the riot, turmoil, and bloodshed that accompanied its annual processions. Orangemen defied the Act of Suppression.[61] Lodges were kept open and processions held as before, and, says the *Report* of the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835, "the objects and intentions of the law were thus frustrated." The Irish Grand Lodge defiantly declared, in its address to the Protestants of the Empire that the Orange institution could not be surpressed but by means which would subvert the Constitution of Great Britain.[62]

Orange processions had hitherto been illegal at common law. Stanley's Processions Act of 1832 made them so by statute law as well. The brethren, however, frankly disregarded the Act of Parliament. Grand Secretary Fairman, in his letter of August 11, 1832, wrote that the Irish Orangemen were "determined to resist all attempts that shall be made by a Whig Ministry to interrupt their meetings or suspend their processions."[63] Lieutenant-Colonel Blacker, in a letter given in Appendix to Irish *Report*, and dated "Carrick, Portadown, July 18, 1833," declared that if the Government would persist in enforcing this Act, the brethren would have three processions where they had held

---

[58] Appendix 6 to *Report*. See chap. xiv., *infra*. Cf. Qq. 5674-5677.
[59] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 3938, 4520, 4464 to 4490.
[60] *Ibid.*, Q. 4522.
[61] *Ibid.*, Q. 7063; also *Report* of Committee (English), p. vii.
[62] Appendix to *Report* of Select Committee.
[63] Fairman Letters in Appendix to *Report* of Select Committee (English), and in Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*.

but one before. As a matter of fact, the evidence brought before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 proves that Orange processions were held just as before. On July 12, 1834, some 3,000 turbulent Orangemen marched, in spite of the reading of the Riot Act, to Portglenone, and other large bodies of the brethren at Stewartstown, Dungannon, and elsewhere.[64] These illegal demonstrations were countenanced by the Irish Grand Lodge. Under date November 12, 1834, it offers "its heartfelt thanks and congratulations to our brethren" who had paraded in their thousands "through the various parts of Ireland."[65] In the following July the illegal processions trebled the number of the previous year. Details of the facts thus far summarily stated will be found in the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Select Parliamentary Committees on Orange lodges. Several Orangemen were brought up before Judge Pennefather on serious charges arising out of one of these illegal and dangerous displays. They were asked, on conviction, to express regret for their conduct. For reply they whistled "The Protestant Boys" in the dock, and were sentenced to three weeks' imprisonment.[66]

The same tale runs on from 1845 onwards. Orange processions, with their attendant disturbances, were kept up soon after the ghastly horrors of the famine years. In 1865 and the three following years the armed processionists violently opposed the forces of the Crown. A prominent place among the disorderly "loyalists" must be accorded to the notorious Killyman "Wreckers," who were stated to have been able to put into the field about 5,000 men.[67] On the twelfth of July, 1867, Deputy Grand Master Johnston led a long procession of Orangemen to Bangor, in defiance of the civil authorities.[68] On this occasion the brethren carried 67 flags, were accompanied by bands, and provided with firearms and ammunition, "in case the worst came to the worst." All this was contrary to the express provisions of the Party Processions Act of 1860. For his share in these proceedings Mr. Johnston was, with others, tried at the Down Assizes, February 28, 1868, and sentenced to a month's imprisonment. He at once became the idol of the lodges of Ulster. His portrait found an honoured place in almost every Orange home, along with that of the hero of the Boyne; and, at the next elections, he was returned to Parliament. In 1871 the Canadian Orangemen likewise

[64] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 4466, 4572-4580; Appendices C. 6, pp. 90-124.
[65] Appendix to *Report* of Select Committee (Irish), p. 77.
[66] Hansard, Third Series, volume xxx., p. 292; *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report*, Qq. 3561-3569.
[67] *Hist. of Orangeism*, by "M.P."
[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 256-257.

defied the proclamations of Government, marched in procession through the streets, and resisted the police and military, with the result that some thirty lives were immolated to the memory of William of Orange. Montreal was again and again the scene of such riots as people have long been accustomed to witness in the Orange centres of Ulster. From 1871 to 1878, every succeeding twelfth of July witnessed its scenes of bloodshed and confusion in the centres of Orange activity in Canada.[69] Deputy Grand Master Mr. Johnston, in moving the repeal of the Party Processions Act on March 30, 1870, said: "The effect of the continuance of this Act has been *to double the number of processions*. It excited the feelings of the Orangemen; *its technicalities were evaded, and the demonstrations went on all the same*."[70] He added that "outrage and bloodshed had prevailed in Canada while an Act similar to this was on the Statute Book."[71] The *Times* of July 14, 1870, describes how a monster procession of 30,000 to 50,000 Orangemen took place at Lisburn, with banners and sashes displayed all along the route, in defiance of the Party Processions Act. According to the newspaper reports of the time, a leading spirit in these proceedings was our old friend, Mr. Johnston, M.P. In the course of his speech on the occasion, he commended the Apprentice Boys of Derry for having "refused, *at the bidding of any man or any Government*," to give up their party displays.[72] It is needless to further multiply instances of the brethren's disregard of Acts of Parliament, and of the forces of the Crown, on the occasion of their anniversary celebrations.

The events connected with the celebration of Orange anniversaries in Australia go to show that the Australian lodges are true to the traditions of the parent society in Ulster. This is especially true of Victoria, where, from 1894 to 1897, processions have been held at which not alone were the society's regalia worn, but party banners were displayed, or deadly weapons carried, or party tunes played, in defiance of the most generous interpretation ever put upon the local Party Processions Act.[73] The society is beginning to feel the strength of

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 260. Cf. *Chambers' Encyclo.*, Art. "Orangemen."

[70] Hansard, vol. ii. of Session, p. 940.

[71] *Ibid.*

[72] This speech was reported in the *Times*, from which this extract has been taken.

[73] For instance, at Ararat (Victoria), in 1894; at Walhalla and Prahran (Melbourne) in 1897. See *Ararat Advertiser*, *Walhalla Chronicle* (July 2, 1897), and Melbourne *Argus* and *Age* of June 28, 1897. The Crown Solicitor for Victoria, Mr. Finlayson, gave it as his opinion that Orange processions are unlawful in the colony, if arms are carried, or party banners

its pinions, and has been essaying its trial flights against the law. Judging by the experience of Ulster and of Canada, we may not unfairly assume that, should the brethren ever attain to sufficient physical force of numbers in Australia, they will here also raise their heads against the representatives of law and order, and set at calm defiance statutes intended to spare the country the pernicious *results* of those unnecessary displays which are, which are known to be, and which, as we have likewise seen, are intended to be, highly offensive to the most cherished feelings of a large section of the community. Enough has, however, been said to show that the steady policy of the lodge has ever been, and still is, defiance of the law, and even armed opposition to it, from the moment that it stands in the way of those criminally foolish displays which make the Orange portions of Ulster a warning spectacle to the English-speaking world.

---

displayed, or party tunes played, but not otherwise. This opinion has been received with much surprise, and has met with strong dissent. Mr. Box and other eminent counsel declare that such processions are unlawful assemblies even if Orange regalia are worn. Melbourne *Age*, *Argus*, and *Herald*, July 16 and 17, 1897. As these pages go through the press the daily papers announce that the legality of such processions is to be tested. A riot was reported from Coolgardie in the gold-land. It arose out of an Orange procession, with its usual display of offensive party emblems. *Ararat Advertiser*, July 13, 1897.

Chapter XI.

ORANGE DEMONSTRATIONS: THE FORCES MARSHALLED AND GETTING TO WORK—PARTY TUNES, PARTY CRIES AND EMBLEMS, AND THE BIG, BIG DRUM—AN ORANGE HOLIDAY: HOW THE BRETHREN DO THEIR MERRYMAKING IN ULSTER —WHO PAYS THE RECKONING?—SOME FORMS OF OPPOSITION.

In the Orange processions that take place in Ulster we have two sets of opposing forces brought face to face, namely:

1. The Orange party;
2. The Catholic party.

1. *The Orange Party.*—(*a*) The Orange processionists celebrate, in the midst of a Catholic population, a triumph of their party over the Catholics; (*b*) they are usually excited to a high pitch of animosity against Catholics, partly by old traditions of strife and mutual reprisals, partly by the violent No-Popery literature of the lodges, but chiefly through the intemperate harangues of their leaders; (*c*) many, if not all of them, bear deadly weapons about them.

2. *The Catholic Party.*—These processions and other public displays of the Orange society are, and are publicly known to be, irritating to the Catholic party,

(*a*) Because of the offensive speeches and sermons delivered on such occasions;

(*b*) Because of the associations which they bring to the minds of Catholics: namely, the ascendency of an intolerant minority, a long and bitter religious persecution, the political annihilation and social degradation of the members of their creed, and that, too, till a comparatively recent period of history;

(*c*) Because of the methods which have been traditionally adopted to enhance the triumph of the Orange party: namely, the display of party emblems, the playing of party tunes, the uttering of offensive party cries, intimidation, violence, outrage, and bloodshed. I think it is the Philosopher of the Sandwich Islands who says that there is a great deal of human nature in the average man. Now it requires but little knowledge of the average man to foresee the results which will ensue when

two large and opposing forces of excited citizens are brought together under circumstances of this kind. From a perusal of the last chapter the reader has gained an idea of the extent to which Orange processionists flouted the symbol of constituted authority, defied the Executive of the country, resisted the forces of the Crown. It is, *à priori*, unlikely that their demeanour would be milder or more gentle towards their Catholic fellow-citizens, against whom their passions are inflamed, and to celebrate their triumph over whom these processions are primarily intended.

Lord Camden (Viceroy of Ireland, and, of course, a Protestant), said that, though not aimed against the Government, he regarded the Orange combination "as more dangerous than direct conspiracy." They "justly irritated the Catholics," said he, "and gave a pretence to the disaffected."[1] The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the great Belfast riots of 1857 says in its *Report*: "Hitherto we find by the evidence that, *except in the month of July*, the inhabitants of these districts[2] have met in peace; in business there were ordinarily no distinctions made, and Protestants, Catholics, and Orangemen lived together in friendship. The feeling which leads to the separation of these districts *in July* is merely a class feeling—it is a feeling of *dominancy and insult on the one side, and of opposition to its display on the other*."[3] "Lord Enniskillen,"[4] the same *Report* continues, "no doubt condemns the violence and outward manifestation of insult to the Roman Catholics exhibited by the Sandy-row [Orange] mob, yet it is seen that *they are directly the effects on vulgar minds of the celebrations that are kept alive and in offensive activity by the Orange society*."[5]

I have, in previous chapters, detailed the offensive and inflammatory character of the speeches made at Orange demonstrations, as well as the nature of the historic associations which impart an added sting to the celebration of these anniversaries. It only remains to point out certain features of these displays, which are intended to heighten the triumph of the one side, and to aggravate its offensiveness to the other. These are the display of party colours and emblems, the

[1] Letter to Portland, 6th August, 1796, in Froude's *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 197.

[2] The Pound and Sandy-row districts. The Pound district, in Belfast, is mostly inhabited by Catholics; the Sandy-row district is the great Orange quarter. They adjoin each other. (*Report*, p. 2).

[3] *Report*, p. 2.

[4] The Orange Grand Master.

[5] *Report*, p. 11. See also evidence of Dr. James McKnight, in chapter x., *supra*.

playing of party tunes, the uttering of party cries, acts of intimidation, violence, outrage, etc.

TUNES, CRIES, AND EMBLEMS.

Mr. Thomas McKnight, an Ulster Protestant, whose sympathies are by no means with the Catholic party, says of the Orangemen in a recent work: "In comparison with the liberty to walk in processions with fifes, drums and banners . . . they cared little for 'our Protestant institutions,' and for a professedly Conservative Government."[6] The party tunes played at these processions include such as "Croppies Lie Down," "We'll Kick the Pope Before Us," "The Boyne Water," "The Protestant Boys," "The Protestant Drum," "More Holy Water," etc.[7] Mr. Handcock, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, was asked by the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges:

"Are those tunes deemed offensive by the Catholics, *and evidently intended to give offence to them*, by the party who play the tunes?" "*Certainly they are*," was the witness's reply.[8] Evidence to the same effect was given by the well-known Presbyterian journalist, Dr. James McKnight, before the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Derry riots of 1869. This distinguished witness declared that he was "decidedly" in favour of prohibiting at demonstrations all band-playing which would "give offence to the other side."[9]

These party tunes are usually, in Ulster, either played on fifes, or are rapped out in conventional fashion on drums. According to Mr. Saunderson, a Protestant Ulster M.P., the drum-beating is meant to be offensive to Catholics. An Orangeman told him that they practised it "because those large drums drove terror into the Papists."[10] Sir Frederick Stoven testified before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that these drum-beatings and processions were calculated to insult Catholics.[11] Mr. James Sinclair, J.P., Mr. Stratton (a police-constable), and many other Protestants, gave similar testimony. The Belfast Royal Commission of 1886 fully recognises the offensive character of those party tunes, and

---

[6] *Ulster as it is; or, Twenty-eight Years' Experience as an Irish Editor.* Macmillan; 1896.

[7] See article on "The Orange Society," in *The Contemporary Review* for August, 1896, p. 224. "Croppy" is an offensive term still applied by Orangemen to Catholics. For the origin of the word, see Lecky's *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 272.

[8] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 5698, 7973.

[9] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5370.

[10] Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. cc., p. 960.

[11] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 4651-4654, 4657.

recommends either the complete prohibition, or the severest regulation, of bands likely to play them.[12] A common cry at Orange processions is: "No Pope, no priests, no holy water!" The traditional and favourite cry is: "To Hell with the Pope!" The *Report* of the Select Committee on the Belfast Corporation Bill of 1896 shows that this expression is in constant use in the head-centre of Orangeism to the present day.[13] Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen deposed before the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 that he never knew of a case in which an Orangeman was expelled from the society for having uttered this offensive party watchword.[14] It is needless to point out that the playing of such tunes and the utterance of such cries must be a source of galling insult to Catholics, and doubly so when we consider the deep attachment and veneration of the Irish people for the visible head of their Church on earth.

The Orange emblems most in use in Ireland are sashes, flags, lillies, ribbons, handkerchiefs, etc. In Australia wattle-blossom, yellow ribbons, handkerchiefs, etc., are displayed. Yellow chrysanthemums are frequently substituted for the Orange lily, which at the Antipodes refuses to disclose its spotted petals in July.

National and party emblems are as purely conventional signs as the handshake of friends, the Queen's crown, the judge's wig, the mourner's band of crape. But they enter far more intimately into public life and feeling, than the conventions that are purely social. They place before the eye, in concrete form, the traditions, associations, aspirations, triumphs of a nation, party, or society, written in a shorthand which the most illiterate has learned to read. Such emblems as flags, brazen eagles, crescents, Phrygian caps, the white cockades of the Stuarts and Bourbons, etc., have been the rallying points of regiments, parties, and nations. The records of history show that they are highly capable of exciting in the popular breast the passions of enthusiastic love or hate. At Fort Sumter a shot is fired at a piece of canvas covered with stars and stripes. The act is indignantly resented as an outrage on a nation's honour, and leads to the greatest civil war of the nineteenth century. Another shot fired at another canvas emblem in a South American forest leads to a diplomatic difficulty, and brings England and Venezuela to the verge of war. The historians of the Peninsular, Crimean, and Franco-German wars tell with pride how soldiers died to save their

[12] *Report*, Appendix F2.
[13] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 5559, 6354, 6357, 6359.
[14] *Ibid.*, Q. 8605.

regimental colours. And men have been prepared to follow and die for such incongruous party emblems as a leather apron, and an old shoe tied upon a staff.

Emblems are not less powerful to excite hate than love. Through a long and stormy epoch of English history, the Lancastrians hated the white rose of York, just as cordially as those of York detested the red rose of Lancaster, and the display of either emblem often stained the streets with citizens' blood. The Bourbon lillies were as hateful to the Sansculottes as the Phrygian cap to the fallen aristocrats. The Greeks hated the crescent flag that floated so long over the Acropolis; Orangemen hate the Pope's tiara and crossed keys; British naval officers were roused to indignation, and British sailors to fury, by the sight of a broom lashed to the masthead of Admiral Van Trompf's flagship. In the same way, Irish Catholics object to the display of certain emblems at Orange anniversaries. The objection is not a capricious one, directed against the mere material emblems in themselves. It is grounded on the associations which they bring, *and are intended to bring*, to the minds of Catholics: memories of the triumph of an intolerant minority, memories of the political ruin, social degradation, bitter persecution, and humiliation of five-sixths of the population of the land of their hearts' love. The display of emblems and colours, and the other features of the typical L.O.L. demonstration, are, as the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 says, "regarded as a studied insult by the Roman Catholics, and as a triumph by the Orangemen, and a declaration of their superiority over their Roman Catholic brethren."[15]

---

[15] *Report*, p. 9. See beginning of chapter x., *supra*. There is only one *party* colour known in Ireland, namely, orange. *Green* is the *national* colour, and is officially recognised as such. It appears on the uniform of the Irish regiments, and, if my memory serves me right, forms part of the colour scheme in the ceiling of the House of Commons. Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen, admitted before the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 that green was the national, and not a party colour (I quote from memory). During the debate on the proposed repeal of the Party Processions Act in 1870, Mr. W. Verner, one of the officers of the Irish Grand Lodge, said in the House of Commons, "he was not disposed to view the green as a party colour, for he had often worn the shamrock [the Irish national emblem] on the 17th March, in order to show that he was not ashamed of his nationality." Hansard, vol. cc. (second vol. of Session, 1870), p. 947. He added that he was "an upholder of the principles of the Orange society" (*ibid.*). The Williamite army wore emblems of the national colour in their hats when crossing the Boyne in 1690. "Every soldier," says Macaulay, "was to put a green bough in his hat." *Hist. of England*, vol. iii., p. 629. McCann, in his *Battle of the Boyne*, says that William's soldiers, as they crossed, were "almost hidden beneath flashing arms and green boughs" (quoted in Sullivan's *Story of Ireland*, chap. lxv., p. 419). Each of James's French and Irish troops, according to Macaulay, "had a white badge in

Such displays are justified by no plea of necessity or utility. They are simply offensive, and are meant as such. We have seen in the last chapter how they stand condemned by the almost unanimous voice of British Protestant statesmanship as inimical to the cause of loyalty and peace.

Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen, in his evidence before the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857, disapproved of the display of Orange scarves even in a church. A strong condemnation of the system of wearing Orange emblems was contained in the General Orders issued by General Cockburne, an Irish Protestant, in 1810, when he vainly attempted to put down the lodges which existed among his troops at Chelmsford in violation of military regulations. He directed the officers of all regiments "to confine any man who dared to wear any riband or emblem which might create dispute among the men." "It must be evident," he continues, "that this order applies chiefly to the Irish soldiers. The mischief which all such party divisions occasion to the State is, unfortunately, too severely felt in Ireland. Nothing of the kind can be allowed here. Soldiers have no concern with such matters. They should serve his Majesty and their country with unanimity, which it is impossible for them to do if the spirit of party be allowed in a battalion."[16] What would bring about such evil effects among men living under the restraint of military discipline might naturally be expected to produce either worse results, or like results in an aggravated form, among the civil population, the expression of whose feelings is not subjected to the iron curb of camp or barrack-room.

THE CRIMSON STAIN.

Orange demonstrations would still be a serious menace to the public even if they consisted only of offensive and inflammatory addresses from pulpit and platform, the use of party colours and emblems, party cries, etc. Unfortunately, they have not stopped here; they have left a broad track of outrage and bloodshed along the course of Irish history, from the rise of the institution in 1795 down to the present day. The causes of this blood-guiltiness are to be sought in the following three circumstances, two of which have been already noted:

1. The strong sectarian feeling aroused by their leaders, and by lodge literature and traditions in the rank and file of the Orange body.

---

his hat. That colour had been chosen in compliment to the House of Bourbon." *Hist. of England*, vol. iii., p. 62.

[16] Given in full in Plowden's *History of Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 125-126.

2. The habitual use of arms in Orange processions.

3. The opposition frequently aroused among Catholics by the insults, outcries, challenges, threatening and overbearing demeanour, and outrages of the processionists.

Three circumstances have combined to make the Catholic body in the Orange portions of Ulster (whatever the strength of their feelings may have been) slow to offer an active physical opposition to L.O.L. processions:

(*a*) Centuries of persecution, subjection, and helplessness had instilled into them a long-suffering patience under insult and injury.

(*b*) Even if they had felt disposed to repel or punish insult or violence by physical force, there were two things which mitigated against such a project: (1) Through what may, in the circumstances, be deemed a happy lack of organisation, they could seldom or never assemble in such numbers as the well-organised members of the lodges; (2) owing to the unfair operation of the Arms Acts against Catholics, and to other causes, they were never so well armed, or so skilled in the use of weapons, as the large bodies of men whom the lodge celebrations concentrated annually in the great Orange centres of Ulster. In most cases, as Dr. Robert Mullen pointed out to the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, resistance to Orange violence on the part of Catholics would, in the circumstances, have led to the annihilation of the latter.[17]

(*c*) With Catholics, a third restraining influence is supplied by the efforts of their clergy to prevent collisions between the opposing parties. The exertions of Bishop Crolly and his clergy at Crossgar, etc., in 1830 were testified to before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835. Mr. Stanley (a Protestant, and Chief Secretary for Ireland), condemned in the House of Commons the menacing attitude of Orangemen in 1832, and admitted that the peace was kept owing to the praiseworthy conduct of the Catholics, and to the manner in which they followed the advice of their spiritual guides. The Royal Commissions of 1857, 1869, and 1886, and many of the witnesses examined by them, bore willing testimony to the efforts made by the Catholic clergy in the interests of public peace. A procession of about a thousand Orangemen, decked out in full regalia, took place at Brunswick (Melbourne), on Sunday, July 18, 1897. On all hands serious riots were anticipated, but the forebodings were happily not fulfilled. The *Argus* of the following day, in an editorial, attributes the freedom from

[17] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 6141. Further evidence on the superior armament of the Orange party was given by Messrs. Christie, Sinclair J.P., Stratton, and others. See chap. x., *supra*.

grave disturbances mainly to the pacific admonitions of the Catholic clergy of Melbourne. In its issue of July 20, 1897, it states that "the Chief Commissioner of Police [a Protestant] considers the force were greatly aided in their work by the appeal made by the Catholic clergy, by the direction of Archbishop Carr, to the members of that denomination to absent themselves from the procession." A cloud of Protestant witnesses have testified to the usually peaceable demeanour of Ulster Catholics, under great provocation, on the occasion of Orange anniversaries. Sir Frederick Stoven, Mr. Richardson Bell, J.P., Mr. W. J. Handcock, J.P., Mr. James Christie, of the Society of Friends, Mr. James Sinclair, J.P., and many other Protestants gave direct or indirect evidence of the patience of Catholics under grave exasperation, before the Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835. Referring to the Derry disturbances of 1870, the *Times* said that the majority of the Roman Catholics "had shown the most laudable forbearance."[18] During Lord Carlisle's Viceroyalty, the Lord Chancellor (Maziere Brady) declared, in his letter of October 6, 1857, to the Lieutenant of Down, that the Orange society was mainly responsible for the breaches of the peace then constantly occurring.[19] On February 18, of the following year, Lord Palmerston supported Chancellor Brady in replying to a protesting deputation of Ulster Orangemen. "Is it," he said, "an organisation which belongs to the age in which we live? Is it not rather one that is suited to the middle ages—to those periods of society when anarchy has prevailed?" *He ridiculed the idea that they were a defensive association*, and concluded by recommending the dissolution of the society. "I am sure," said he, "that there is nothing that they could do which would more materially contribute to the peace of Ireland, and to the obliteration of ancient prejudices . . . It would be an essential advantage to the country at large. . . I can but repeat that nothing could be more desirable for the real interests of Ireland than the complete abandonment of the association."[20]

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the great Belfast sectarian riots of 1886—one of the most volcanic years in later Orange history—said in their *Report*: "For a considerable period—at all events from the 8th June to the 19th September . . . *the principal actors in the rioting were what is known as*

[18] *Times*, July 16, 1870.

[19] The letter was published in the *Northern Whig*. See chap. xiv., *infra*.

[20] A report of this deputation appears in the London morning papers of February 19, 1858

the Protestant mob."[21] Later on in their *Report* the Commissioners say: "Unquestionably, however, a main cause of the prolonged continuance of the disturbances was the wild and unreasoning hostility exhibited by a large section of the Protestants of Belfast against the police."[22] Mr. Miller, a Protestant magistrate of Belfast, deposed before the Commissioners that "the Catholic mob were more amenable to reason" than the "Orange mob."[23] Mr. M'Clelland, another Protestant magistrate, stated that "the Catholic party were well behaved," and that "*the endurance and patience of the Catholics during the riots was simply wonderful.*"[24] This he largely attributed to the pacific efforts of the Catholic bishop and clergy. As evidence of the more peaceable character of the Catholic minority on this occasion, the Commissioners point out that the amount of damage done to the property of the latter was far greater than that done to the property of Protestants. Twenty-nine publichouses, for instance, belonging to Catholics, and only two belonging to Protestants, were wrecked and looted; while twenty out of the twenty-nine private houses wrecked belonged to Catholics,[25] who, it may be added, were in 1981 only 26·3 per cent. of the Belfast population.

It may be generally stated that the reprisals of Catholics were made under the bitter stimulus of such provocation as should never be needlessly given in any well-ordered community, and least of all by a society which professes to be guided in its whole policy by love of religion, loyalty to the Throne, and obedience to constituted authority.

THE DANCE OF DEATH.

One of the most reprehensible features in the conduct of Orange processionists is their habit of unprovokedly invading Catholic quarters of the same town or city (as very often in Belfast), or marching under arms on Catholic villages or districts at a distance. The great riots of Belfast, in 1864, began in the invasion of the Pound (Catholic quarter) by the armed Orangemen of Sandy-row, and their attempt to desecrate the Catholic cemetery by the mock burial of a hideous effigy of Daniel O'Connell.[26] The Protestant historian, Mitchel, tells

[21] *Report*, p. 11.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 16; see Mr. McKnight's opinion, *infra*. This hostility to the guardians of law and order found a vigorous echo in the *Victorian Standard* of December 1, 1886.

[23] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 6452.

[24] *Ibid.*, Q. 8870.

[25] *Report*, p. 11.

[26] See *Report* of Royal Commission of 1864.

how, on the 12th of July, 1808, Fr. Duane, parish priest of Mountrath, was barbarously murdered by armed Orange processionists from a distance.[27] An even worse outrage took place in the same town on the following 12th of July.[28] On the first of this same July, at Bailieborough (Co. Cavan), a body of armed Orange yeomanry marched on the house of the parish priest, fired several shots at him, and left him for dead.[29] "None of the persons guilty of these outrages was ever punished, or even questioned," says Mitchel. A similar result followed the massacre of twenty-four men and two women, by armed Orangemen, at the fair of Shercock (Co. Cavan) in 1814.[30]

All, or almost all, of the following facts—among many others of a similar kind—will be found in the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835:

The Catholic village of Carrowkeel was burned in 1813 by two bodies of armed Orange processionists, who had come from a distance of some ten miles. Nine lives were lost on the occasion. The affair was ventilated in the House of Commons by Sir Henry Montgomery, when not a voice was raised in defence of the methods of the Orange society. A similar outrage was perpetrated at Caledon. During the Emancipation agitation, Catholic villages and districts were frequently invaded by the loyal "sons of William." In 1830, after the Emancipation Bill was passed, a number of Catholic villages in Ulster were burned, or otherwise wrecked, and many of their inhabitants shot, by Orangemen who had come from a distance of many miles away. I need only mention the sanguinary invasion and destruction of Crossgar and Maghery, which have become historic throughout the North.[31] In the following year (1831) Banbridge was a scene of riot, wrecking and bloodshed. As many as 400 shots were said to have been fired on the occasion by the armed Orange processionists. In the same year occurred the massacre of Tullorier, in the County Down. The Orange processionists shot an old woman in her house, pursued four Catholic men, fired upon them, drove them into the river and drowned them. On midsummer eve, 1830, some children were murdered by Orangemen at Tanderagee. After having served a term of imprison-

[27] Mitchel's *Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., c. xv., p. 136.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] *Life and Times of O'Connell*, vol. ii., p. 120.
[31] Cf. chap. iii., *supra*, *notes* 19 and 20, pp. 42, 43. For Crossgar see *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 4313, etc.

ment only, two of the four murderers were escorted from prison, with bands and banners, by their fellow Orangemen.[32] In 1834, outrages of a serious kind were carried on for ten consecutive months by the notorious "Black Lodge," until at last the Irish Grand Lodge was provoked into condemning and disavowing them. The Catholic village of Annahagh was invaded from a distance on June 17, 1835, by large bodies of armed brethren, and sixteen Catholic houses in it burned to the ground.[33] As usual, no Orangeman was ever punished for his part in that outrage. These and such like outrages drew the attention of Parliament to the necessity of investigation into the Orange system, and led to the appointment of the Committees of Inquiry of 1835. A summary list of the principal Orange outrages committed during the years 1836-1839 will be found in Barry O'Brien's *Life and Letters* of the distinguished Irish Under-Secretary, Thomas Drummond.[34] On the twelfth of July, 1849, while the country was still reeling from the effects of the great famine, some 2,000 Orange processionists invaded and wrecked the Catholic village of Dolly's Brae, in the County Down. They were on their way from Ballyward to Castlewellan, and had their choice of two roads. One of these, says the *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1850, was "the natural one." It was, moreover, as Commissioner Berwick said in his official *Report*, "a comparatively good and level road." It was the route which, as Grand Master Beers admitted, the processionists had followed in peace the previous year. The other, or old road led by the village of Dolly's Brae. It was, says the same Government Commissioner, "bad and hilly," so that, as the *Edinburgh Review* states, it was "rarely used," and "a procession going from Ballyward to Castlewellan would avoid Dolly's Brae, unless, indeed, they *went out of their way on purpose*." In consequence of a murder committed in their midst by Orangemen many years before, and of certain house-wreckings by local Oragemen in the previous year, the villagers determined to oppose the procession. The civil authorities endeavoured to have the route altered, but Grand Master Beers declared that "no power on earth would prevent the Orangemen going by Dolly's Brae." Mr. Berwick declared in his Official *Report* (p. 10) that the Orangemen who

[32] *Ibid.*, Qq. 6388, *sqq.*; also App. D2, and Sup. 3 to Appendices.

[33] An idea of the riotous conduct of these armed processions, the terrorism which they caused, and their disregard for the lives and property of Catholics, may be gathered from the evidence of Lord Gosford, Sir F. Stoven (Inspector-General of Police), Captain Duff, and other Protestant witnesses on the burning of Annahagh. See *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 3363-3474, etc., etc.; also Hansard, Third Series, vol. xxvii., p. 1074.

[34] Pp. 347-351.

" assembled in numbers, with display of arms and an avowed determination to proceed through a Roman Catholic district by a particular road, where resistance was anticipated and a collision expected," constituted "an unlawful assembly," which "ought to have been discountenanced in the outset, warned of the consequences of such conduct, and, if necessary, prevented altogether; certainly, at the very least, hindered from passing along the road where danger was apprehended." Some 800 to 1,200 of the Catholic party, many of them armed, assembled to oppose the procession. Owing to the exertions of two priests, the brethren were permitted to march through the village in undisturbed triumph. Beers was not satisfied with this victory. Despite the earnest remonstrances of Mr. Fitzmaurice, the stipendiary magistrate, he marched his men back again through Dolly's Brae. The evidence subsequently adduced made it clear to Mr. Berwick that they were determined to provoke a breach of the peace. The Orangemen were, as Sub-Inspector Hill, Mr. Berwick, and others testified, heavily armed, some five hundred of their number carrying guns, bayonets, etc. Party cries rang out, and feeling ran high. At a critical moment, according to the evidence of Major White, Sub-Inspector Jann, and other witnesses, a shot or squib was fired from the head of the procession. It was answered by shots from the villagers and their sympathisers, who were posted on a hill, about a hundred yards from the Orangemen. Then the firing became general. The police charged and promptly dispersed the Catholic or Ribbon party. Some two hundred Orangemen pursued them, firing as they went, their bullets whistling indiscriminately among police and Ribbonmen. And here the fighting ended. Whilst the rear of the procession was thus engaged, those in front—a considerable distance away—fell furiously on the village of Magheramayo, *where they had met with no opposition*, wrecked, plundered, and burned the houses, spread devastation in the fields round about, and murdered defenceless and unoffending persons in cold blood. Mr. Berwick, a Protestant, who was subsequently sent down as Commissioner to inquire into the massacre, says in his official *Report*: "Whilst this was going on above, I lament to say that the work of retaliation, both on life and property, by the Orange party, was proceeding lower down the hill and along the side of the road in a most brutal and wanton manner, reflecting the deepest disgrace on all by whom it was perpetrated or encouraged. One little boy, ten years old, was deliberately fired at and shot while running across a field. Mr. Fitzmaurice [stipendiary magistrate] stopped a man in the

act of firing at a girl who was rushing from her father's house. An old woman of seventy was murdered, and the skull of an idiot was beaten in with the butts of their muskets. Another old woman was severely beaten in her house, while another, who was subsequently saved by the police, was much injured, and left in her house, *which had been set on fire.* An inoffensive man was taken out of his house, dragged to his garden, and stabbed to death by three men with bayonets, in the sight of some of his family. The Roman Catholic chapel, the house of the Roman Catholic curate, and the National school-house, were fired into and the windows broken; and a number of the surrounding houses of the Roman Catholic inhabitants were set on fire and burnt, every article of furniture having been first wantonly destroyed therein; and had it not been for the active interference of magistrates and the troops, much more loss of life and property would undoubtedly have taken place." The chief fury of the Orange party seems to have been directed against the women of Magheramayo. Besides those who were killed, a young girl and an old woman of seventy (Rose King) were seriously wounded, and at least three more were, with difficulty, rescued by the police from their burning houses, or from various forms of brutal illtreatment at the hands of men who are (on paper) required—as a condition of membership of their society —to be "gentle, compassionate, kind, and courteous." Sub-Inspector Ponsonby Hill described the actions of the Orange processionists as "disgraceful outrages." Sub-Inspector Jann writes of them to his superior officers: "The gross outrages committed [by the Orangemen] are nearly beyond the power of description, and demand a searching investigation." "No language," he continues, "can describe the scene of horror that has been enacted in the neighbourhood." During the course of the investigation subsequently held by Commissioner Berwick, Grand Master Beers, the ringleader of the Orange party, said of the outrages of his followers: "I call it a very serious blot, and deplore it deeply, as a man of humanity and as a gentleman, or any man." The "victory" of Dolly's Brae was speedily celebrated by a banquet to the hero of the day, Mr. Beers, whereof Mr. Berwick thus writes in his official *Report* (p. 9): "Considering the recent calamity, the occurrence of this dinner at such a time, presided over by the High Sheriff, who is the officer by law appointed to select the panel of jurors before whom all parties charged with offences in that county must be tried, and accompanied by the utterance of such sentiments, in his presence, must be lamented as highly tending to shake public confidence in the administration of

justice, and to increase the exasperation which existed." Such was the "battle" of Dolly's Brae, which Grand Chaplain Drew termed a "victory"; and which has many a time and oft furnished a theme for the halting couplets of the laureates of the Orange society.[35]

On July 12, 1860, a large body of armed brethren who were celebrating their anniversary under the thin disguise of a "musical festival"—such as took place at Richmond (Victoria) in 1895—used their weapons to such purpose that some fourteen persons were killed or wounded at the village of Derrymacash. This sanguinary riot led to the Processions Act of August 20, 1860, amending that of 1850, and forbidding the use of weapons and party emblems in processions.[36] The Ulster brethren greeted the new measure with threats of armed resistance, and with a fierce salvo of vituperation directed against the Queen, Parliament, the judges, and the dignitaries of the Established Church.

Referring to an Orange demonstration in County Monaghan, which led to a riot, the *Times* of July 16, 1870, has the following: "The *Northern Whig* observes that the inhabitants of the district are nearly all Roman Catholics, so that the propriety of having any Orange celebration was strongly questioned." The *Northern Whig* is a Protestant paper of a very pronounced anti-Nationalist type.

The Derry riots of 1883 began by the Apprentice Boys storming and taking possession of the Town Hall that had been hired by the National Registration Committee for Alderman Dawson, M.P., Lord Mayor of Dublin, for a lecture on the Electoral Reform Bill, *which became law in the following year.* According to the *Report* of the Royal Commission of In-

---

[35]See Berwick's official *Report* on the massacre, issued as a Government Blue Book by order of the House of Lords, bearing date February 18, 1850. Incorporated with it are the *Reports* of the Police officials, and minutes of the court proceedings at Castlewilliam. See also *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1850. Regarding the firing of the first shot or squib, the *Edinburgh Review* states positively that it "was fired from the head of the procession." It says: "The evidence is conflicting, whether the squib came from the road or the hill. There are seven or eight witnesses in support of each opinion; but where there is plainly a general leaning *towards* the Orangemen, the agreement *against* them of the three commanding officers, Major White, of the Enniskillens, Captain Fitzmaurice, the stipendary, and Mr. Hill, the Inspector of Police, *is to our judgment conclusive.*" Berwick's *Report* on the Dolly's Brae massacre was so strong that Grand Master Beers, J.P., and Lord Roden—the leaders of the Orange party—were deprived of the Commission of the Peace.

[36]*Hist. of Orangeism* by "M.P.", p. 241.

quiry,[37] this act of illegality was perpetrated under the very eyes of a large force of police that stood around the building. No attempt was made by them to stop the disorderly crowd of Apprentice Boys,[38] who discharged their firearms from the windows of the City Hall against the Catholic crowds gathered around. The *Report* of the Derry Commission (1883) is founded almost entirely on Protestant evidence. The Catholics protested against what they called a mere *Kid-glove* method of inquiry. They demanded a sworn investigation, with summary powers vested in the Commissioners. The Government having refused to accede to their demand, the representative Catholics of Derry declined to recognise the Commission, and practically boycotted it.

RIOTING THROUGH LOYALTY.

In referring to the invasion of Catholic districts, mention should be made of the persistent series of counter-demonstrations organised by the Orange party for the purpose of interfering with, intimidating, or breaking up Nationalist meetings during the Home Rule agitation in the eighties. The Lord Chancellor had declared such Nationalist demonstrations to be perfectly legal. "Parties," he continued, "who assail such a meeting would be common disturbers of the public peace, but parties who, after organising a counter-meeting, bring their forces in close proximity to the place of the meeting which is objectionable to them, particularly when in doing so they exhibit indications of defiance, or a challenge, incur responsibility of a most serious character—that of endangering the public peace in the very highest degree."[39] These counter-demonstrations were organised in every case, as far as I know, by the officers of the Orange institution, were fed by great numbers of the brethren from a distance, and took place for the most part in districts where the Catholic population were in a majority.[40] Subscriptions were raised by the leaders of

---

[37] *Report*, p. vii. See also the report of the Orange organ, the Dublin *Daily Express*, November 2, 1883.

[38] *Ibid.* The Apprentice Boys of Derry are to all intents and purposes Orangemen under a different name. See chap. x., *supra*, *note* 16.

[39] Letter to Sir John Leslie, ex-M.P. for Monaghan, dated December 17, 1883. Mr. George Scott, County Grand Master for Dublin, admitted that the Orange counter-meeting summoned by him for Kill-o'-the-Grange "might be interpreted as inciting to illegal acts" (Dublin *Evening Mail*, January 26, 1884, last ed.). Captain Hamilton signed a placard intimating that the proposed meeting would be "illegal." The placard is quoted in Mr. Healy's *Loyalty plus Murder*, p. 62. In spite of their known illegality, Orange counter-demonstrations continued to be held throughout Ulster.

[40] Nationalist meetings were allowed and Orange counter-demonstra-

the Orange party "to defray the expenses of securing the attendance of loyal men."[41] Wildly inflammatory placards, signed by the leaders of the organisation, were printed in the Orange press, and posted up in the districts where the Nationalist meetings had been previously announced. From press, platform, or dead-wall the brethren were urged to be "ready with their *sweethearts and plenty of stuff*;"[42] to "bring refreshments;"[43] to provide themselves with "plenty of material;"[44] to "never use a revolver except they were firing at someone."[45] "Keep the cartridge in the rifle," said a gallant colonel to the brethren at Rathmines, January 10, 1884. "Keep your powder dry," was the advice of an agitator at Derry.[46] "Keep a firm grip on your sticks," said another at Dromore on New Year's Day, 1884. And so on and on. I have already quoted the statement made by Chief-Secretary Sir George Trevelyan regarding the "sackfuls of revolvers" taken by the police from the Orange party on the occasion of their counter-demonstration at Dromore, January 1, 1884.[47] He thus describes the condition to which Ulster had been brought by the seditious incitements of the Orange leaders: "In spite of the fact that Ulster was full of armed men, who were excited to an extreme degree by the violent speeches of their leaders; that every hand brandished a cudgel; that tens

tions took place in the following districts in the end of 1883 and up to February 1884:

Parishes.	Tot. Pop.	R.C.	Prot.	Presb.
Strabane	4,196 ..	2,720 ..	693 ..	685
Pomeroy	5,231 ..	3,537 ..	734 ..	892
Aughnacloy	1,333 ..	624 ..	566 ..	210
Dungannon	4,109 ..	2,312 ..	836 ..	933
Castlederg	5,452 ..	3,748 ..	940 ..	505
Drumquin	4,109 ..	2,312 ..	836 ..	933
Omagh	4,126 ..	2,424 ..	922 ..	580
Rosslea	6,069 ..	4,394 ..	1,357 ..	258
Total	34,625 ..	22,071 ..	6,884 ..	4,996

This table is given in preface to *Loyalty plus Murder*, by Mr. T. M. Healy, M.P. A thousand ship-carpenters were announced, by plentiful posters, to attend a counter-meeting at Dungannon—100 miles away—on September 27, 1883. *Daily Express*, September 24, 1883.

[41] The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* of December 26, 1883, published a circular calling for subscriptions in the above terms. It was issued by the Tyrone Grand Lodge, and was signed by the Deputy County Grand Master, and three others.

[42] *Daily Express*, November 6, 1883.

[43] From circular issued to the lodges of Londonderry.

[44] *Daily Express*, November 6, 1883.

[45] *Daily Express*, December 8, 1883.

[46] *Daily Express*, October 11, 1883.

[47] See chap. x., *supra*.

of thousands of revolvers were being carried about; and that the leaders of the men were telling them to take a firm grip of their sticks, and not to fire their pistols except when they were certain of hitting somebody, the winter had so far passed with no great or striking disaster."[48]

In Derry, towards the close of 1883, riots of so serious a nature were originated by the Orange party, that a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into them. In December of the same year the Apprentice Boys defied a proclamation forbidding their annual celebration of the siege of Derry.[49] On New Year's day, 1884, a large body of Orangemen assembled, armed with revolvers, etc., in the proclaimed district of Dromore, and attacked a legal meeting of Nationalists. The Riot Act was read a first and second time; the police and military charged the brethren twice with lance and bayonet, wounded several, and killed an unfortunate Orange youth named Giffen.[50] In its comment on the inquest of Giffen, the chief organ of the Irish lodges said: "The men may have misbehaved; they may have deserved what they got; but it is very painful to the feelings of all people to find the Queen's troops charging and cutting down even *rioters who are urged on to riot by loyalty*."[51]

At Belfast the passions of the Orange proletariat were wrought up to a high fury by screaming placards and by the perfervid oratory of itinerant agitators. Among the stirring incidents of the time, I may mention the following: A large body of Orange torch-light processionists attacked and smashed the windows of the convent of Ballynafeigh. The Superior, Mother de Chantal, had been in a delicate state of health for some time. The cheers and cries of the processionists, the noise of the falling stones, and the crash of the smashed glass caused such a shock to her system that she died in a few hours after the attack.[52] Further serious damage was done to property in other parts of Belfast. The police were violently set upon with stones and broken bottles by the Orange rioters; some twenty of the "loyalists" were fined or imprisoned; and the Resident Magistrate, Mr. Hamilton (a Protestant), referred in terms of strong condemnation to the "objectionable proceedings" and the "disgraceful behaviour" of the culprits who had been brought before him.[53] For over

[48] Hansard, vol. cclxxxiv., p. 384.

[49] The *Daily Express* commends their action in its issue of December 19, 1883.

[50] *Freeman's Journal*, January 2, 1884.

[51] *Daily Express*, January 3, 1884.

[52] See *Freeman's Journal* of date.

[53] *Freeman's Journal*, October 10, 1883, and previous issues.

two years the embers of religious hate smouldered on, until they broke forth into the historic conflagration which has been termed the Belfast civil war of 1886. Whereof, more anon.

These are but samples, taken more or less at random from the recorded doings of Orange processionists. The list of outrages published in 1797 by an eye-witness, in *A View of the State of Ireland*,[54] makes quite a bulky pamphlet, although it deals with a comparatively small district, and with only a little over one year of Orange history. The scope of the present chapters makes it necessary to adduce only a few leading instances, covering a wide period of the society's annals, to point out (*a*) the spirit that animates the July processionists; (*b*) a peculiarly reprehensible feature in their celebrations; and (*c*) to show what may be expected in these new lands if ever the institutions should become a power among us. The history of Canada from 1871 to 1878, and the wreckings of Catholic houses, churches, and convents in the Dominion,[55] furnish an example and a warning to legislators in other portions of the British Empire.

AN ULSTER HOLIDAY.

Writing on the subject of the massacre of Dolly's Brae and the invasion of Catholic districts by the brethren, John Mitchel—an Ulsterman and Protestant—quotes with approval the following description of what he terms "the usual Orange style" of celebrating the "glorious twelfth." "It is written," he says, "by one who knew the North of Ireland well:"

"In some districts of that country Protestants are the majority of the people. The old policy of the Government had been to arm the Protestants and disarm the Catholics. The magistrates at all sessions are Orangemen, or high British loyalists. In those districts, therefore, Catholics lead the lives of dogs—lie down in fear, and rise up in foreboding. Their worship is insulted, and their very funerals are made an occasion of riot. One of the July anniversaries comes round—the days of Aughrim and the Boyne: the pious Evangelicals must celebrate those disastrous but hard fought battles, where William of Nassau, with his army of French Huguenots, Danes, and Dutchmen, overthrew the power of Ireland, and made the noble old Celtic race hewers of wood and drawers of water even unto this day. Lodges assemble at some central point, with drums and fifes playing 'The Protestant Boys.' At the rendezvous are the Grand Masters, with their sashes and aprons—a beautiful show. Procession formed, they walk

[54] See chap. ii., *note* 68, *supra*, pp. 28-29.
[55] Chambers' *Encyclopædia*, ed. 1867, art. "Orangemen."

in lodges, each with its banner of orange or purple, and garlands of orange lilies borne high on poles. Most have arms, yeomanry muskets or pistols, or ancient swords whetted for the occasion. They arrive at some other town or village, dine in the public-house, drink the 'glorious, pious, and immortal memory of King William,' and 'To Hell with the Pope'; re-form their procession after dinner, and *then* comes the time for Protestant action. They march through a Papist townland; at every house they stop and play 'Croppies, Lie Down!' and the 'Boyne Water,' firing a few shots over the house at the same time. The doors are shut, the family in terror; the father, standing on the floor with knitted brow and teeth clenched through the nether lip, grasping a pitchfork (for the police long since found out and took away his gun). Bitter memories of the feuds of ages darken his soul. Outside, with taunting music and brutal jests and laughter, stand in their ranks the Protestant communicants. The old grandmother can endure no longer; she rushes out, with grey hair streaming, and kneels on the road before them. She clasps her old, thin hands, and curses them in the name of God and His Holy Mother. Loud laughs are the answer, and a shot or two over the house or in through the window. The old crone, in frantic exasperation, takes up a stone and hurls it with feeble hand against the insulting crew. There, the first assault is committed; everything is lawful now; smash go the unglazed windows and their frames; zealous Protestants rush into the house raging; the man is shot down at his own threshold, the cabin is wrecked, and the procession, playing 'Croppies, Lie Down!' proceeds to another Popish den. So the Reformation is vindicated. The names of Ballyvarly and Tullyorier will rise to the lips of many a man who reads this description."[56]

And so on and on. Year after year the Orange centres of Ulster—and they alone of all the land—are the scenes of sectarian riot and confusion. July after July police and military are drafted thither to keep the peace, and the ratepayers suffer. The reader has already seen how Mr. Christie, an eye-witness, and member of the Society of Friends, deposed before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 that every 12th of July, from the rise of Orangeism in 1795 down to that date, had been marked by riot and outrage.[57] From 1835 down to the present day there had been little or no change for the better. The Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 says in its *Report* (p. 4): "The 12th of July has always brought with it its Orange

[56] Mitchel's *Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., c., xxvii., p. 250, *note*. (Cameron and Ferguson's ed.).

[57] See *note* 5, chap. x.

gatherings, its party displays, its consequent riots. In different degrees the rioting was serious or but slight in different years, but differing only in degree—riots, disorder, the firing of shots in one district, with answering shots from the other—all these things were annually displayed in a town like Belfast, so improved and so plainly improving, threatening at any moment outbreaks and riots which might imperil the safety of property and of life in the entire town." Some of the greatest disturbances caused or occasioned by Orange demonstrations were those of 1857, 1864, 1869, 1872, 1883, and 1886—the cyclonic area being in each of these instances one or other of the twin capitals of L.O.L. life and activity, Belfast and Derry. The Belfast riots of 1886 lasted over four months. During that time firearms were freely used, steady firing being kept up for days together, as during the great disturbances of 1857.[58] What the Royal Commissioners term in their *Report* "fast firing" went on "without intermission" at times, and even women were shot at in the streets.[59] Mr. T. McKnight, an eminent Belfast Protestant journalist, already referred to, describes in his recent work, *Ulster As It Is*, the deadly antipathy of the brethren to the police who were drafted into Belfast to quell the disturbances. The riots of 1886 had the following results:

At least thirty-two lives were lost.[60]

Three hundred and seventy-one policemen were injured by the rioters.[61]

Thirty-one public houses were wrecked, looted, etc.[62]

Twenty-nine private houses were wrecked, twenty of them belonging to Catholics.[63]

The value of the property destroyed by the rioters was estimated at £90,000,[64] which had to be made good by the ratepayers.

Four hundred and forty-two arrests were made, and the number of the police alone in the city (the military not counted here) amounted to close on 2000.[65]

PAYING THE PIPER.

All this is but one specimen of what is witnessed in the "loyal and prosperous North." The Derry procession of

[58] *Report* of Royal Commission of 1857, p. 6.
[59] P. 6.
[60] *Report* of Royal Commission, Supplement B2.
[61] *Ibid.*, Appendix B.
[62] *Ibid.*
[63] *Ibid.*
[64] *Report* of Royal Commission, p. 4
[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.

December, 1869, cost the ratepayers at least £12,000. That of August, 1870, was computed to cost the city a like sum.[66] The ratepayers have not merely to defray the expenses of these large extra forces of police and military which are drafted to Ulster every year, but also to make compensation for the malicious injury done to property during those periods of religious war which so often disgrace the Orange centres of Ulster—and which are happily unknown in other parts of Ireland. Reports for 1896 show that in Belfast, Newry, Paisley (Scotland), and elsewhere, the Orange society is still maintaining the traditions which befit an Association for the Perpetuation of Religious Rancour.

It is easy to judge from these few sample facts and figures the disastrous inroads which these foolish demonstrations make every year upon the pockets of the ratepayers of Belfast, Derry, Armagh, Portadown, and other centres of Orange life in Ulster. The total cessation of these displays, besides the happy effect it would have of allaying sectarian rancour, would permit of large sums of money to be spent on works of public utility. It is no wonder, therefore, that the *Times*[67] advocated, even on economic grounds, the total prohibition of Orange processions. Such a prohibition, it declared, would have been "the shortest, cheapest, and surest method of preserving order."[68]

AS OTHERS SEE THEM.

The Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 characterises as a public scandal, the disorder and confusion in Belfast, arising out of these demonstrations. "And all this," said their *Report*, "*resulting from the foolish anxiety of some of the inhabitants to keep alive scenes that are, in later days, idle displays merely of offence.*"[69] Similar language (quoted in the last chapter) was used in the House of Commons, in 1870, by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Chichester Fortescue.[70] Elsewhere in their *Report*, the Royal Commissioners of 1857 declare: "*The celebration of that festival (12th July) by the Orange party in Belfast is plainly and unmistakably the originating cause* of these riots."[71] A similar conclusion was arrived at by the Royal Commissions of 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886. One and all of them recom-

[66] The *Derry Journal*, quoted by the *Times*, 16th August, 1870. The *Times* of 13th December, 1869, refers to the fierce anti-Disestablishment Orange displays of that year as "the explosion of Protestant feeling in Belfast and Dublin, and the violent expression of Orange bitterness."

[67] *Times*, August 16, 1870.

[68] *Ibid.*, August 15, 1870.

[69] *Report*, p. 15.

[70] Hansard, vol. cciii., Third Series, p. 186.

[71] *Report*, p. 9, etc.

mended the suppression of party processions of all kinds. The Belfast Royal Commissioners of 1857 say in their *Report*: "The Processions Act, and the steps taken to repress these celebrations, are legislative declarations of their impropriety and dangerous consequences."[72] They express a hope that "the reasonable and calm-thinking of all parties" will "exercise their influence *in preventing the future public celebrations of the twelfth of July* in a manner to excite the population around them, *even if good sense, good feeling, and the love of order and peace will not induce them to effect a more thorough cure by its non-celebration in future.*"[73] Similar advice was given by Mr. Berwick, the Commissioner appointed to inquire into the Dolly's Brae massacre of 1849. In his *Report*, he strongly urges upon the Government the necessity of putting down Orange processions with a strong hand. The curious reader will find a strong and very general condemnation of Orange processions, by Protestant Government officials, in the *Minutes of Evidence* of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords in 1839 to inquire into the state of Ireland with respect to crime. Among the witnesses who gave evidence before that Committee, there was probably not one whose knowledge of the country was so intimate and extensive as that of its distinguished Under-Secretary, Mr. Thomas Drummond. He testified to the beneficial effects which had followed the energetic efforts put forth by the Executive in his time to suppress the Orange processions in the North.[74] "It has led," said he, "to a diminution of those riots which took place at fairs and other places where the hostile parties met, as well as on other occasions."[75] "The effect of the processions," he continued, "was not confined to the days on which they took place. The spirit excited on those days remained for a long period afterwards; and on every succeeding fair, or wherever the people were brought together, disturbances followed. The suppression of the processions has put a stop to those disturbances."[76] Similar evidence was laid before the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords in 1852 to inquire into outrages in Ireland.[77]

---

[72] *Report*, p. 9.

[73] *Ibid.*

[74] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 12291, 12326.

[75] *Ibid.*, Qq. 12327-12328.

[76] *Ibid.*, Q. 12328. See also the strong evidence of Mr. G. Warburton, Deputy Inspector-General of Police (Qq. 807-813), of Mr. Hamilton (Qq. 9137-9164), etc.

[77] *Sessional Papers*, House of Lords, Session 1852-1853, vol. lxx. Select Committee on outrages (Ireland). See evidence of Mr. Kirk, an Armagh manufacturer, Qq. 4385-4386.

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Derry disturbances of 1869, refers in strong terms to the "exasperation" caused by these celebrations, recommend the prevention of all open-air party processions, and declare that the Catholics are quite willing to accept such a general prohibition.[78] Events soon proved that the Orange party were not so amenable to reason, even in the interest of public peace. During the course of this inquiry thirty-six witnesses, representing every phase of religious and political thought, declared against all party processions in Derry. The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast riots of 1886 urged the Government to confer summary power on the local authorities to prevent all processions of a kind calculated to produce a breach of the peace.[79]

To the list of statesmen and politicians who have condemned Orange processions, I may add the following: Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Chief Secretary for Ireland, in opposing the repeal of the Party Processions Act in 1870, said, on behalf of the Government: "They (the Government) were not prepared, in the present condition of Ireland, to do that which would appear to be a proclamation on their part that these party processions were harmless or inoffensive, and without danger to the peace and prosperity of Ireland."[80] During the debate on the same Bill, Mr. Saunderson (who was then a quasi-Liberal, but subsequently an Orangeman) said in the House of Commons that, "in the present disturbed state of Ireland, all processions, of whatever character, were a great misfortune and ought to be avoided, and the Grand Jury of the county where he resided had adopted a memorial to the Government to that effect."[81] The testimony of Mr. Johnston of Ballykilbeg (an Orangeman) on this subject, and that of the Irish Grand Lodge, have already been quoted. It only remains to add that the suppression of Irish Orangeism in 1825, and the Party Processions Acts of 1832, 1850, and 1860 (which were occasioned by the violence of the lodges), are so many practical expressions by the British Parliament of its conviction that

[78] *Report*, pp. 16, 19.

[79] *Report*, p. 16.

[80] Hansard, vol. cciii., Third Series, p. 165. On March 30, he said that such peace as existed in Ulster was "in spite of these party processions." (Hansard of date, p. 943).

[81] *Ibid.*, vol. cc., Third Series, p. 960. Mr. Saunderson was Major, and is now Colonel, in the Cavan Fusiliers. At the Roselea Orange counter-demonstration, October 16, 1883, he moved a resolution beginning: "That *we*, the loyal Orangemen of Newtownbutler," etc. (*Freeman's Journal*, October 17, 1883). He also signed a placard addressed "to the Orangemen of Cavan," calling upon them to make a counter-demonstration at Cootehill on New Year's day, 1884. His speeches at this period were of the shrillest kind. See, for instance, the *Daily Express*, January 11, 1884.

the public proceedings of the society are inimical to the peace of the country.

The Grand Lodge has repeatedly confirmed the expulsion of Orangemen for such high crimes as "marrying a Papist," voting against their Grand Master, supporting candidates that favoured Catholic Emancipation, etc. I have yet to find in the annals of Orange history a single instance in which a member of the society was expelled for taking part in illegal processions, defying the forces of the Crown, or destroying the property, shedding the blood, or taking the lives of his "Roman Catholic brethren." In a subsequent chapter I shall have occasion to consider, in some detail, the methods by which lodge criminals or misdemeanants have been glorified as heroes, or systematically shielded by Orange magistrates and jurymen from the legal consequences of their misdeeds.

GETTING THEIR BLOOD UP.

In estimating the effect of Orange demonstrations on the public peace, we must take into account not merely the nature of the feelings, but likewise the character of the opposition, which they are calculated to evoke in the Catholic body. In doing so we must not form our judgment from the effects which they produce in the minds of the more staid, pious, or patient portion of the Catholic laity: we must take people in the mass, as they actually are, and not as they would be if living under ideal conditions.

The average human being is easily aroused by personal insult—still more, when such insult is uncalled-for, deliberate, unprovoked, and oft-repeated. The sense of wrong, and the resulting provocation, are, perhaps, only aggravated when the offensive action or display touches certain cherished feelings that are not simply and purely personal, such as religious sentiment, national pride, party honour. Here you touch the nation, creed, or party, on the quick, and arouse elements which make for riot, party strife, or war. The reader has already seen how all these grounds of high offence to Catholics are contained in what the *Times* terms those public "exhibitions of sectarian rancour"[82]—Orange demonstrations, with their inflammatory discourses and outcries, their acts of insult and violence, and, running through all, the bitter associations that they bring of the betrayal, impoverishment, persecution, and long-attempted degradation of a people. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that, in the course of a century, the deep sense of brooding wrong and resentment of the Catholic masses in Ulster has at times found expression in acts of resistance

[82] *Times*, August 15, 1870.

or of retaliation. Happily, these provoking displays of party triumph have not evoked their full natural measure of retaliation. This, however, is due to no forbearance on the part of the brethren, but (as has been shown above) to circumstances which are quite external to their organisation. The expression of the resentment of the Catholic masses has taken, at various times and places, one or other, or both, of the following shapes:

1. *Against Orange displays*: Attempts to prevent or to disturb processions, or invasions of Catholic quarters or villages, etc.; counter-demonstrations.

2. *Against Orange outrages:* The formation of counter-associations in self-defence.

The reader will bear in mind that I am not defending these expressions of Catholic discontent. My purpose is to give a record of warning incidents which deserve to be more widely known, in the hope that these new lands may be spared some of the heart-burnings which have been the bane of Ulster ever since 1795.

A LOSING BATTLE.

1. The story of ill-advised attempts to prevent, disturb, or interfere with the full course of the brethren's periodical processions, raids, or invasions in Ulster, has been already practically told. In most instances the opposition has been feeble; in nearly every case disastrous to its promoters. The story of the unprovoked Orange raids on Derrygonnelly (1811), Carrowkeel (1813), Maghery (1830), Banbridge (1831), Annahagh (1835), Dolly's Brae (1849), Derrymacash (1860), and many other such, has proved the folly of the ill-armed and unorganised Catholic party flinging themselves—even in defence of their hearths and lives—against compact and well-organised masses of from 1000 to 50,000 men, most of them in the prime of life, and armed, altogether or in part, with rifles, shot guns, revolvers, swords, bayonets, etc. The great Belfast sectarian riots of 1857 and 1886 were cases in point, and proved, by their results, how disastrous it was for the small Catholic minority there to attempt to "fight it out" with what Rev. Dr. Johnston (a Protestant clergyman) termed that "very riotous and ill-disposed set," the Orange mob of Sandy-row.[83]

The Belfast Royal Commission of 1857 condemned Orange demonstrations altogether, as being direct incitements to breaches of the peace. Such being the case, they said in their

[83] *Report* of Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast Riots of 1886, p. 20.

Report: "We think it a matter of little moment by whom the first blow was struck, or the first stone was thrown."[84] The *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1836, dealing with the *Report* of the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges, says: "Admit all the recriminations against the Catholics for violent obstruction of the Orange processions, for severe and often savage retaliation of wrongs, for party spirit in the witness-box—they seldom reach the jury or the bench—and for all the secret working of their Ribbon societies; yet, if proved to the fullest extent, to what do all these charges amount? They make out no case or excuse for the existence of Orangeism. On the contrary, *these offences of the Catholics are the necessary consequences of the Orange insults and outrages. Thus, the heavier the charges which the Orangemen substantiate against the Catholics, the stronger is the recoil upon themselves.*"[85]

COUNTER-ASSOCIATIONS.

2. Another serious outcome of the proceedings of the Orange society has been frequently brought under the notice of the British public. This is, its tendency to give rise to counter-demonstrations of a defensive character. In Ulster this tendency is increased by the notorious difficulty which Catholics experience in obtaining legal redress from Orange magistrates or jurors. The Orange writer, Musgrave, sufficiently indicates this effect of the Orange system in the very book which he wrote as the apology of the society. "However useful," said he, "the Orange institution may be in a country where the members of the Established Church are numerous, it must be allowed that it must have been injurious where there are but few, because it only tended to excite the vengeance of the Romanists against them; and they could not unite in sufficient numbers for the defence. It should not be admitted in our regular army, or militia, consisting of both, as it would be likely to create party zeal and discord."[86]

While the society was still in its infancy—in 1796—it displayed its capacity for forcing its victims to betake themselves, for self-defence, to other secret and illegal associations. Abundant proof of this is published by the authors of what Lecky terms the "evidently truthful *Memoir*" written for the Government in 1798. They say: "We will here remark, once for all, what we solemnly aver, that wherever the Orange system was introduced, particularly in Catholic counties, it was uniformly observed that the numbers of the United Irishmen

[84] *Report*, p. 6.
[85] Quoted by "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 211.
[86] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, ed. 1801, vol. i., p. 74.

increased most astonishingly. The alarm which an Orange lodge created among the Catholics made them look for refuge by joining together in the United system."[87]

In the great debate on the Orange society that took place in the House of Commons, June 29th, 1813, Mr. William Wynne, a Protestant M.P., said that "certainly it was impossible to conceive an institution more ill-timed in itself or more mischievous in its operation. (Hear, hear.) Everyone could see that, if these societies were permitted, *they should give rise to others of a similar character*, and thus one part of the country would be arrayed against the other, with all the jealousies of political faction and hatred."[88] In the following year (1814) Judge Fletcher said, in the course of his historic charge at the Wexford Summer Assizes: "I have observed, too, as the consequence of those Orange combinations and confederacies, men, ferocious in their habits, uneducated, not knowing what remedy to resort to, in their despair, flying in the face of the law, entering into dangerous and criminal counter-associations, and endeavouring to procure arms, in order to meet, upon equal terms, their Orange assailants."[89] An illustration of this was furnished by the great Belfast riots of 1857. After the bloodshed and incendiarism of July 12th and 13th of that year, some ill-advised members of the Catholic body—finding the local forces unable or unwilling to protect them[90]—formed a gun club,[91] so as to cope on more equal terms with the Orangemen, who had been previously armed at the lodges.[92] On the 4th of May, 1824, during a debate on Orange lodges, Sir John Newport drew the attention of the House of Commons to judicial remarks made to a grand jury during the last circuit: "That if they allowed Orange societies, they must be prepared for Ribbon societies, one of which created the other." As a matter of fact, the Orangemen called into existence the Ribbonmen of Ulster, who first made their appearance about 1812.[93]

---

[87] *Memoirs*, p. 6; also given in full in McNevin's *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 178. See chap. ii., *supra*, *note* 45, p. 24.

[88] Quoted by "M.P.," p. 144.

[89] Judge Fletcher's *Charge* was published in pamphlet form, by the Irish Press Agency, in 1886.

[90] The local forces and the constabulary were (omniously enough) under the control of Captain *William Verner*, Captain *Thomas Verner*, Mr. Getty, and Mr. Thompson. See chap. xiv., *infra*.

[91] *Report* of Royal Commission of 1857, p. 8.

[92] "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 234.

[93] Wyse, *Hist. of the Catholic Association*, vol. i., p. 409. Mr W. Kirk, a manufacturer residing in Armagh county, deposed before the Select Committee of 1852 on outrages (Ireland) that in Ulster the Ribbon system of twenty years before, was a purely defensive organisation as against the Orangemen (*Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 4381). Similar evidence was given by

"But the latter" [the Ribbonmen], says Molesworth, "had been brought into existence by the provocations of the former [the Orangemen]; and though they greatly damaged the cause they were intended to serve, and helped by their crimes to keep alive the bitter feeling that existed on the other, yet the mischief they did was not on the same great national scale as that inflicted by the Orange lodges. They were very serious to individuals, but they did not materially retard the pacification of Ireland, and were sure to disappear when its condition was sensibly ameliorated."[94]

The English Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges have the following in their *Report* to the House of Commons: "The obvious tendency and effect of the Orange institution is [among many other evils indicated] . . . *to raise up secret societies among the Catholics in their own defence, and for their own protection against the insults of the Orangemen.*" With their *Report* they incorporate that of Mr. Innes, a Protestant, who was sent by the Lord Advocate of Scotland to inquire into the Orange riots which had taken place in Glasgow and elsewhere in Scotland during the course of that year. "Mr. Innes states," says the *Report*, "on authority on which your Committee place confidence, that the existence of the Orange lodges, their meetings, processions, and proceedings have *roused an opposition on the part of Catholics to protect themselves from the insults offered by the Orangemen*, and that secret societies have been formed for the purpose, by which the members can be called forth at any time, when occasion shall require their meeting, *to protect themselves against the insults of the Orangemen, or be revenged on them.*" Referring to the scenes of riot and bloodshed of 1848, in which various Ulster lodges bore a leading part, a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* of that year remarks: "The evil of these exclusive associations is the ill-will which they engender, *the resistance which they provoke*, and *the counter-associations which they infallibly call into existence.*"[95] In his evidence before the Derry Royal Commission of 1869, Dr. James McKnight told how in the County Down "the Orange

---

Fathers McMeel and Lennon (Qq. 2681-2683, 2883-2884, 3070-3072, 3084-3088, 3174-3176, 3512-3517, 3731-3745, etc.). Various Protestant witnesses testified to the efforts made by the Catholic clergy to suppress the Ribbon society. See, for instance, Qq. 561-569, 2893-2896, 2913-2921, 2935, 3269, 3270, 3281, 3283, 3287-3288, 3446-3453. Father McMeel stated that the Ribbonmen did not attend mass or their religious duties (Qq. 3137-3140), Captain Fitzmaurice pointed out that there was no sectarian feeling against Protestants among the Ribbonmen in Limerick and Tipperary (Q. 457), and that the juries there did their duties fearlessly (Q. 559).

[94] *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 278.

[95] Quoted by "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 225.

processions were very prevalent, and they invariably ended in collisions, and bloodshed frequently; and very terrible atrocities were committed by parties breaking and firing into houses. In fact, the existence of one organisation provokes a defensive organisation on the other side."[96] "I think," said he, "it is the duty of a Government to put down every celebration, imperatively, of the historic nature I have described."[97] Nay, more: he considered it "essential to public safety" to make their suppression a matter of "imperial policy."[98] The effects produced by the Orange society on the public peace are thus summed up by the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Belfast riots of 1857:

"Mr. Gwynne, speaking for the Grand Orange society, and expressly sanctioned by the Earl of Enniskillen, announced the great principle of the society to be 'Protestantism, loyalty, and organisation,' . . . but that this organisation tends directly to interfere with the peace of this part of the kingdom, we think that the history of the transactions in the North of Ireland during the past few years abundantly evidences. And these late transctions in Belfast are a later lesson, making it clear to the least observer."[99] Further evidence of its disastrous effects on the peace of the community will appear as we proceed.

[96] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5378.
[97] *Ibid.*, Q. 5339. He refers to the Orange demonstrations.
[98] *Ibid.*, Q. 5374.
[99] *Report*, p. 10.

Chapter XII.

THE LOYALTY OF THE ORANGE SOCIETY.—CLEARING THE GROUND: A DEFINITION OF TERMS—OFFICIAL PROFESSIONS AND OFFICIAL PRACTICE: FIVE "OBLIGATIONS" OF AN ORANGEMAN—HOW THE BRETHREN AID THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES—WHAT "A SLIGHT EXUBERANCE OF LOYALTY" MEANS—LOYALTY IN THE MARKET: ITS SELLING PRICE.

In legal practice, and in discussion generally, a good deal often turns on a right understanding of the meaning of words. The long dispute between Great Britain and the United States over the Alabama case hinged on the meaning of the word "equip" in the expression used in international law, "to equip a ship of war." He was, then, a wise old logican who said that, in dealing with certain disputed points, the first essential is right definition of terms; the second, right definition; the third, right definition. This necessity is forcibly brought home to the student of history in dealing with the mottoes, etc., which profess to enunciate the scope of party action in the sphere of politics. In the case of secret societies, especially, watchwords are not infrequently selected which are in themselves ambiguous (as, for instance, the "DIO E IL POPOLO"[1] of an Italian political association); in other cases, private or party meanings are forced upon the words of the motto, as in the case of the "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" of the great French Revolution, or the title, "American *Protective* Association," applied to a secret organisation—the Orangemen of the United States—whose object is a guerilla warfare upon the civil rights of their Catholic follow-citizens.[2] The reader has already seen how, among secret associations,

[1] This motto, printed in capitals, may either mean "God and the People" or "God is the people" or, conversely, "The people is God." The word "E" with an accent (so-called) over it (thus è) means "is"; without the accent (*e*) it means "and." In capitals, inscriptions, etc., the accent is often omitted, and the public are thus left to judge for themselves, in the case before us, whether the basis of the association is theistic or atheistic.

[2] See pp. 11-12, *supra*.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

fine phrases are all too frequently used to cloak designs which it would be impolitic on their part to openly avow.

In preceding chapters I have shown that certain of the watchwords or "qualifications" of the Orange society are at daggers drawn with both the past and current facts of its history. This induces a reasonable suspicion as to the truth or sincerity of the remainder of its professions. In dealing with the question of Orange loyalty, therefore, nothing can be taken for granted. I shall naturally use the term "loyalty" in its ordinary accepted meaning, and then proceed to examine the claim in the light of the evidence which the pages of L.O.L. history place before us. The reader will then be in a position to decide whether, and to what extent, the oft-repeated Orange claim of undying loyalty is justified by facts. If it is not, it matters little whether Orangemen apply a special party meaning to the term in question, or whether they use it directly to cloak designs which it would not be prudent to reveal. In either case, the deception of the uninitiated public would be wilful and of set purpose.

Archbishop Trench, a standard authority on the history and meaning of English words, says: "Loyalty . . . being derived from [Fr.] *loi*, expresses properly the fidelity which one owes according to law, and does not necessarily include that attachment to the royal person which, happily, we in England have been able to throw into the word." Standard dictionaries give to the word both the original and the derived meanings referred to by the distinguished Anglican divine. Webster's dictionary has the following in point under the word "loyal":

"1. Devoted to the maintenance of the law; disposed to uphold the constituted authority; faithful to the lawful Government. . . ."

"2. Faithful to the Sovereign, either as the maker of the law, or as *the personal representative of the Government.*"

The Orange society—nominally at least—accepts this description of loyalty, to its full extent, in the portion of its rules which it ventures to place before the public eye. The "basis of the institution" has the following: "The Orange institution . . . is composed of Protestants *resolved to support and defend, to the utmost of their power*, the Protestant religion, *the laws* of the colony, *and the rightful Sovereign*, being Protestant."

Briefly, then, "loyalty" means, *primarily*, due subjection to law and to constituted authority in the State. Its *secondary* meaning is fidelity or attachment to the person of the Sovereign. When, therefore, Orange speakers and writers refer to the "loyalty" of their association they must, by the very force of

the word, be understood to mean that, *first, and above all*, their society, as such, has been and is obedient to the law of the land and the civil authority; and, secondarily, that it is, and has ever been, faithful and attached to the rightful Sovereign.

If there is one thing in the association that the brethren are proud of, it is the unswerving loyalty which, we are told, has ever been its chief characteristic. It is one of the brightest jewels in the circling diadem of the score or more of domestic, social, and civic virtues which the society professes to cultivate. The very title of the association is the "Loyal Orange Institution." One of its favourite emblems is the royal crown and sceptre *over* the Bible, with the motto: "These we will maintain."[3] At all their demonstrations the dominant note is vehement protestations of the undying loyalty which, we are assured, permeates the flesh and bone, the life and soul, of the whole Orange system. "We [Orangemen] are a law-abiding people," said the "Most Worshipful" Grand Master of Victoria, the Hon. Simon Fraser, M.L.C., at the Melbourne demonstration of 1893.[4] And on the same platform the previous year Deputy Grand Master Mr. R. T. Vale, M.L.A., declared: "There is no getting away from the fact that we [Orangemen] are not only law-abiding, but we insist that everybody else shall be law-abiding."[5] In good and evil, say the brethren, in sunshine and in storm, the society has ever kept one eye fixed upon the Crown, the other on the Constitution. The torture and massacres of 1797-1799, the uproar against Emancipation, Disestablishment, and Parliamentary Reform, the violence and bloodshed of the thirties, the armed riots and counter-demonstrations of the eighties: these were merely the bubbling over of that "exuberance of loyalty" which fills the great throbbing heart of the Orange system to the brim. So speak the leaders.[6] And the multitude of the lesser voices of the Orange platform in every land swell the rising chorus of "loyalty, loyalty."

RATHER SUSPICIOUS.

A priori, there is something suspicious in the mere superfluity and vehemence of these unnecessary protestations of loyalty. "The lady doth protest too much, methinks," says Queen Gertrude to Hamlet in the play. Such eager reiteration of self-laudatory asseverations has been characteristic of Ambrose, the pseudo-

[3] This emblem and motto occupy the middle space in the title of the *Victorian Standard*, the organ of the Orange lodges of Victoria.

[4] *Victorian Standard* report, July, 1893, p. 3.

[5] *Ibid.*, July, 1892.

[6] See chap. xi., *supra*, *note* 51 and text, and the present chap., *notes* 24, 25 and text.

devout sharper *Gil Blas*, of the Tartuffes, the Stigginses, the Pecksniffs, and the whole company of those whose hearts do not beat time with their lips. Teufelsdröck's old servant, in *Sartor Resartus*, "scoured and sorted, and swept in the kitchen, with the least possible violence to the ear." So, too, loyal people are quietly loyal, as brave people are unostentatiously brave. Sir Henry Lawrence and his fellow-heroes of Cawnpore were not the type of men who are given to vapouring. Your braggart is ever a coward at heart—like evergreen old Falstaff, or Captain Terrible, or Don Valiant, or Captain Bluff, who (at the village pot-house) won campaigns in Flanders, and disdained the acquaintance of any but men of courage. There were heroes before Achilles, and there were, before the rise of the Orange institution, and still are, untold millions—in fact the vast majority—of law-abiding citizens, who do not find it necessary to air their loyalty in the press or on the public platform. Loyal submission to constituted authority is, perhaps, the most elemental condition of good citizenship. It is the partition wall which divides the law-abiding subject of the Crown from the criminal classes of the community. Plain, unromantic, every-day citizens feel themselves bound to so much by the laws of God and man alike. They neither demand nor deserve any special credit for it. The persistent protestations of the Orange body imply, therefore, one of two things: either (*a*) that there are elements in their loyalty which elevate it to a far higher and nobler form than that which makes average good citizens of the great bulk of English speaking humanity; or (*b*) that they alone are loyal in the midst of abounding disloyalty. A perusal of the reports of the July anniversaries will alone enable the curious reader to realise how grateful the brethren are that in this, as in many other respects, they are not as the rest of men.[7]

GREAT EXPECTATIONS.

There are three circumstances which—assuming the society's professions of loyalty to be well grounded—entitle us to expect that the pages of L.O.L. history should be teeming with evidence that the brethren always did "support and defend to the utmost of their power" the laws and Constitution of their country:

1. From 1797 to 1835 the Orange society enjoyed great political privileges, power, and influence—everything, in a word, which made the duty of loyalty easy and pleasant. Its adherents found their way into the highest positions in the State. Its Imperial Grand Master was, from 1828 to 1836, none other

[7] See chap. viii., *supra*, pp. 151, *sqq*.

than H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland, whom the Grand Lodge termed, in a draft address, "the next to the Throne."[8]

2. Orangemen admittedly have no grievances. It is the boast of their press and platform that the brethren of the province of Ulster—the cradle and home of the society—are contented, prosperous, educated, and loyal.[9] Ulster Orangemen must, therefore, be comfortable under existing laws. Loyalty under the two sets of conditions just named is a very simple matter indeed. Disloyalty would, in the circumstances, be the extreme of criminal folly. Our sympathy for Rasselas would be very much diminished, had he risen in factious and violent revolt against the authorities of the Happy Valley of Amhara. And it is an ungrateful dog that bites the hand which provides him with a warm kennel and good meals, with choice mutton bones to gnaw between.

3. Again, the conditions of membership of the institution entitles us to expect numerous and signal displays of loyalty on the part of the brethren during the society's long history of over a hundred years. These conditions have been dealt with in some detail in the course of the seventh chapter. It will be sufficient to recall to the readers recollection the following points:

(*a*) Members are elected by a particularly severe form of ballot, already described.

(*b*) They are subject to re-ballot, either singly or in whole

---

[8]Draft of address to Carlton Club, 1834, in *Report* of Parl. Committee (English) of 1835.

[9]The alleged superiority of Ulster in wealth, prosperity, education, contentment, etc., is a favourite theme with Orange writers and speakers. See, for instance, the speech of Hon. Mr. Patterson at the Kyneton demonstration, July, 1885 (in *Victorian Standard*, August, 1885, p. 6); of Rev. R. Kane (in *Victorian Standard*, 1st May, 1886, p. 10); of Rev. J. J. Browne, at the Melbourne demonstration of 1886 (in *Victorian Standard*, 2nd August, 1886); the manifesto of the Irish Grand Lodge (in *Victorian Standard*, July, 1886); the speech of Deputy Grand Master W. Blackburne at the Benalla demonstration, 1892 (reported in *Victorian Standard*, August, 1892); of Grand Master the Hon. S. Fraser, at the Melbourne demonstration, July, 1893 (in *Victorian Standard* of same month); of Past Grand Master Bro. Richardson at the Orange banquet to Hon. S. Fraser (in *Victorian Standard*, May, 1894); and so on of many others. It is worthy of note that, in every case, the brethren carefully abstain from the use of figures. The figment of Ulster's superior wealth has been rudely shattered by the Parliamentary returns of 1882 and following years. Most of these will be found in the *Financial Reform Almanac* and the *Constitutional Year Book* for 1885. They are carefully analysed in the *Contemporary Review* for June, 1893; in the able series of articles written to the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* by a Scotch writer, Mr. Galloway Rigg; in Mr. Clancy's *Ulster;* in Mr. T. M. Healy's *Word for Ireland* (pp. 155, *sqq.*); and in a pamphlet by Rev. P. O'Doherty, M.R.I.A., *The Truth about Ulster* (Verga, Melbourne).

lodges or districts, at any time and in any way that the Grand Lodge may determine.

(*c*) The Belfast Royal Commissioners of 1857 asked the Earl of Enniskillen, Grand Master of the Irish Orangemen: "Do you cause the members, when they commit a breach of the rules, to be called before the lodge and expelled from the society?" He replied: "*From the lodge, I do, in every instance that comes before me.*"[10] Orangemen are not alone dismissable, but are actually dismissed, as I have shown, for such apparent trifles as "marrying a Papist," "voting against the Grand Master,"[11] and other matters which do not seem to be violently subversive of the alleged scope of the institution. If the cultivation of loyalty be, as it is alleged to be, an essential part of the "basis of the institution," we should naturally expect, first, to find that every breach of such a fundamental principle of the society is visited with prompt expulsion; and, secondly, that the elect and dismissable body left should be as select as the noble three hundred who clung to Gideon at Gilead—a sort of glorified Quakers, an abstract and example of all that is law-abiding in English-speaking humanity.

(*d*) The society, which is supposed to admit and retain men of tried loyalty only, has existed in its present shape ever since September 21, 1795, and must have counted in the course of its history many millions of adherents. In the one year, 1835, there were scattered throughout the British Empire close on half a million of Orangemen.[12]

In the circumstances, it is curiously significant that Orange speakers and writers so carefully shun all appeal to the acknowledged facts of the society's history in support of this oft-repeated claim.[13] The reason of this is not far to seek. It is simply this: (1) That the evidence of the brethren's loyalty is not merely lacking, but that it is lacking just where (if credit is to be given to their professions) it ought to be found in greatest abundance; and (2) that the hard facts of the history of this strange survival of the spirit of a past day are altogether inconsistent with this claim of constant respect for the law, and attachment to the person of the Sovereign. To

---

[10] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 8608.

[11] See chaps. v. and vii., *supra*, pp. 96, *sqq.*, 134, *sqq.*

[12] Cf. *Report* of Select Parliamentary Committee (English), near end.

[13] In the course of a somewhat extended reading of the reports of Orange demonstrations and other lodge literature, including the files of the *Victorian Standard* for some thirteen years of its life, the writer cannot recall a single attempt by any L.O.L. speaker or writer to prove the loyalty of the brethren by an appeal to the vouched facts of history. The same statement is true as regards the professions contained in "the qualifications of an Orangeman."

judge from the vehemence and frequency of its protestations, Orangeism stands or falls by its loyalty. The prime importance of the subject, when dealing with this association, will, I trust, be a sufficient apology for the extended space which has been devoted to clearing the ground, and setting the whole question in its proper light.

THE PROMISE

In the course of this chapter I purpose to briefly glance at the leading professions of the Orange society which have a direct or indirect bearing on the subject of loyalty. The remaining chapters of this volume will be devoted to an examination of the manner in which three leading and responsible classes of the brethren have supported the law and upheld their allegiance to the rightful Sovereign. Orangemen bind themselves by oath, or by solemn declarations which are practically equivalent to an oath, or by the penalty of expulsion, to five chief "obligations" which touch the question of loyalty, as defined above.

1. Two of these five "obligations" enforce elementary civic duties to which every man is already bound, apart from, and independent of, oaths, promises, or protestations. They are as follow:[14]

(*a*) *When called upon*, to assist magistrates and the civil authorities in the lawful discharge of their duties.

(*b*) To avoid secret associations whose object is to "subvert" the "just prerogatives of the Crown," "the established rights of property," etc.

2. The remainder of the "obligations" entered into by the brethren have a rank flavour of disloyalty. They are:

(*a*) To bear allegiance to the Sovereign [only] so long as he (or she) supports the Protestant ascendency, or so long as he (or she) remains Protestant (in the Orange sense of the word).

(*b*) To never, in any circumstances, vote for a Catholic at Parliamentary or Municipal elections; to never vote for a non-Orange Protestant unless by the express sanction of the Grand Master or the Grand Lodge; in all other circumstances to vote for Orange candidates only; and to be ready, on occasion, to support them even against the voter's conscientious conviction—in a word, to be disposed, on all occasions, to sacrifice the public good to the private jealousies or personal ambitions of the Grand Master, or to the secret schemes of the Grand Lodge.[15]

(*c*) Not to communicate or reveal "in *any* manner" "*any* of

[14] See Appendix B, *infra*.

[15] See chap. vii., *supra*, pp. 136, *sqq*.

the proceedings" of the brethren in lodge assembled. In the sixth chapter the reader has seen that this "obligation" applies to proceedings in courts of justice, and to other forms of official inquiry.[16] Orangemen thus solemnly, and with religious ceremonies, provide beforehand for future violations of the law—after the manner of the old Duke, mentioned by De Quincey, who used to say: "On next Friday, by the blessing of Heaven, I purpose to be drunk."

AND THE PERFORMANCE.

1. The first "obligation" given above—to aid the civil authorities, etc., *when called upon*—is one which every law-abiding citizen accepts and acts upon as a matter of course. This plain civic duty is, moreover, in many cases (such as felony, riot, affray, etc.), enforceable by fine or imprisonment.[17] Law-abiding citizens need no such oath or protestation. Orangemen have habitually disregared it. It is no easy task to find cases in which the brethren, as such, have aided the civil authorities in the lawful execution of their duties. On the other hand, the instances in which large bodies of the brethren, of every degree, have resisted the law and the officers of the law, are present in such monotonous profusion as to make active disloyalty a part of settled policy of the Orange association.[18] Mr. Sinclair, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, deposed as follows before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges: "I never knew the Orangemen of the North of Ireland, or any portion of them, as Orangemen, assist in the preservation of the peace, or in the execution of the laws. That is my opinion."[19] The Earl of Gosford, another Ulster Protestant witness, testified before the same Committee that in the discharge of his duty as Lieutenant of the County Armagh, "I have found bodies of them [Orangemen] resist the laws. . . . I have found them resist the laws, and refuse to obey the laws as Orangemen."[20] Similar testimony, by other Protestant officials, such as Sir Frederick Stoven, Captain Duff, Mr. Handcock, J.P., and others, as well as the verdicts of five Royal Commissions of Inquiry, have been given

---

[16] See p. 114, *supra*.

[17] *The Justice's Note-book* 6th ed. (1892), pp. 97, 100; Harris's *Principles of the Criminal Law*, 6th ed. (1892), p. 336. It is, for instance, an indictable offence to decline, when called upon, to assist a constable in difficulties, with anyone in his custody. Rewards are offered, in English law, for the arrest of certain classes of criminals by civilians (Harris, pp. 338, 339).

[18] See chaps. x., xi., *supra*, pp, 205, *sqq.*, 217, *sqq.*, and chaps. xiii., xv., *infra*.

[19] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5181.

[20] *Ibid*,, Q. 3289. Cf. Mr. Handcock's evidence, Q. 8799.

in the tenth and eleventh chapters of this volume. The nature of the "aid" given to the civil authorities by the lodges may be briefly summed up as follows :[21]

(1) Hooting at, and applying offensive epithets to, police, police officers, and magistrates, who had dared to do the duty required of them by law.[22]

(2) Defying proclamations by magistrates, mayors, governors of counties, and Lords Lieutenant; organised and long-continued violation of Acts of Parliament, such as the Party Processions Acts of 1832, 1850, and 1860; committing, and provoking others to commit, breaches of the peace; armed terrorising of voters at election contests; organised armed resistance to the forces of the Crown: house-wrecking, arson, murder; refusing to give evidence at magisterial or Parliamentary inquiries; giving false verdicts, etc., in courts of ustice, etc. In the course of the last two chapters I have shown that most, if not all, of these varied forms of law-breaking were connived at or encouraged by the Orange magistracy, and were either passed over, or positively commended, by the great functionaries of the Grand Lodge. Some high officials of the order have even discovered that the crimes and misdemeanours of Orangemen are, after all, but evidences of their loyalty! One of the most noted members of the fraternity, Dr. Duigenan,[23] declared in the Irish House of Commons, in 1798, that what he terms the "excesses" of the early Orangemen, although they "could not be justified," "might be extenuated by *the spirit of loyalty from which they sprung*."[24] At a later date, two grandees who spoke on behalf of the Irish institution coo'd even more gently to a stiffnecked House over the "loyalty" of the armed Orangemen who, in Ulster, year after year, had defied the forces of the Crown, and driven coaches-and-four through the provisions of the Party Processions Act. It was the 7th of July, 1870. There was a debate in the House of Commons on a Bill introduced by Government to restrain all party processions in Ireland. Viscount Crichton declared that the Bill "cast an undeserved insult on the Orangemen of Ireland—*men whose only fault, if it were a fault,*

[21] See *Reports* of Parl. Committees and Royal Commissions, *passim*, and chaps. x., xi., xiii., xv. of this volume.

[22] See chap. v., *supra*, p. 98, and chaps. x., xi.

[23] Dr. Duigenan was, early in 1798, a member of lodge No. 176 (Dublin) of which Sir Jonah Barrington was also a member. *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Committee of 1835, Q. 9522. In his *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation* (2nd ed., chap. xv., pp. 229-233), Sir Jonah details Duigenan's lack of principle, and his "outrageous" and "unreasonable" bigotry against Catholics. See also *Curran and his Contemporaries*, by Charles Phillips.

[24] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 81.

was a slight exuberance of loyalty."[25] During the same debate Lord Claude Hamilton, one of the leading sympathisers of the Irish institution, objected to the bill on behalf of the Orangemen of Ireland: it was, said he, "an insult to those who, however *injudicious*, were still loyal."[26] I have already quoted the bitter complaint made by the *Daily Express*, the chief organ of the Irish lodges, against the Queen's troops for "charging and cutting down [Orange] rioters who are *urged on to riot by loyalty.*"[27] To the present day the Orange portions of Ulster witness, July after July, that "slight exuberance of loyalty" which an Irish Chief Secretary termed "the annual specimen of civil war"[28]: they become an armed camp, into which great forces of police and military are drafted, at enormous expense to the ratepayers, to minimise, if they cannot altogether prevent, the disastrous conflicts and wreckings which result from those ill-timed celebrations of party triumph.

(*b*) A further word as to the Orangeman's "obligation" to avoid secret associations whose object is to subvert the established rights of property, etc.: There is nothing in this pledge which entitles the society to even the small distinction of an "honorable mention" for loyalty. (1) Every citizen is bound to avoid such associations, by the law of conscience, and by the gentle suasion of the hangman's rope or of the

[25] Hansard, Third Series, vol. ccii., p. 1684. In 1884 Viscount Crichton had risen to the dignity of Deputy Grand Master for Ireland.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 1690. It has been stated that arms were "very secretly" issued by the authorities of Dublin Castle to some of the Belfast lodges in anticipation of the abortive rising of 1848. This has been advanced by an Orange writer who published a pamphlet at Ballarat in 1867 or 1868 as conclusive proof of the recognition of the loyalty of the association by the Government of the day. But (1) there is no conclusive evidence that the *authorities* at Dublin Castle issued arms, as stated. (2) Lord Clarendon, the viceroy, "denied all knowledge of the shipment of muskets to the Belfast Orangemen" (Mitchel, *Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. xxv., p. 262. *note*). (3) Even had such an incident occurred, it would not necessarily imply an official recognition of the loyalty of the lodges, but rather a disposition to make use of their well-known *fanaticism*, as was done in 1796-1798. (4) Reference to chaps. vi., x., xi., xiv., xv. of this volume will sufficiently indicate to the reader the idea which the British Parliament and Government officials entertained of the "loyalty" of the Orange association. (5) Lord Clarendon refused to acknowledge the Orangemen as such in 1848, or to supply them as such, with arms when Dublin was supposed to be threatened by the Young Ireland party. Such of the brethren as chose joined the volunteers then being raised by Captain Kennedy. Their weapons had to be afterwards paid for out of Captain Kennedy's own pocket. (*Inis-Owen and Tirconnell*, by William James Doherty, pp. 377-378).

[27] *Daily Express*, January 3, 1884.

[28] Mr. Chichester Fortescue in the House of Commons, debate on Party Processions Bill, March 14, 1870. Hansard of date, p. 1888.

convict's ball and chain. (2) Catholics are, moreover, forbidden to join *any* secret society, under serious ecclesiastical penalties, which include that of excommunication. (3) The Orange society is, as we have seen, a secret one. (4) I have shown, in the fourth chapter, that it was inaugurated by a wholesale violation of the "established rights of property." The wrecking, destruction, and plundering of the property of Catholics were carried on over a large area of Ulster from 1795 to 1797; they were renewed in other parts of Ireland in 1798; they have been continued ever since on a smaller scale, and at frequent intervals, in the wrecking of Catholic houses, villages, etc., some details of which have been given in the eleventh chapter. The events which took place at Dolly's Brae in 1849; at Derrymacash in 1860; at Derry so late as 1869 and 1883; in Toronto and other parts of Canada from 1871 to 1878;[29] the state of civil war which desolated Belfast in 1857, 1864, and 1886; all prove that the wild spirit which animated the first lodges in 1795-1797, still exists, in fierce potential energy, in the centres of Orange life and activity.

LOYALTY IN THE MARKET.

2. There is, perhaps, no loyalty echo of the July platform so constant and far-resounding as that of the unswerving devotion of the brethren to the occupant (for the time being) of the British Throne. This is the Koh-i-noor in the circling diadem of the society's graces. To one who, with a faith that is simple and child-like, can accept the "basis of the institution" and the "qualifications of an Orangeman," the contrast between the official professions and the official practices of the society must present a series of riddles as unreadable as the *Ælia Lælia Crispis* of Bologna. The claim of loyalty to the Throne presents, perhaps, the crowning enigma of them all, for it touches the two following fundamental principles of the Orange association:

(*a*) A main purpose of the society is to glorify a successful revolution which dethroned a *de jure* English king (James II.), and placed the British crown on the head of a Dutchman.

(*b*) The Orange oath or solemn protestation of allegiance to the Sovereign has ever been, and is to the present day, expressly conditional and temporary.

In his charge to the Wexford Grand Jury in 1814, Judge Fletcher (a Protestant) puts the following words in the mouth of the typical Orangeman of his day, whom he describes as a "mere pretender to loyalty": "'I am a loyal man in times of tranquility; I am attached to the present order of things so

[29] See chap. i., *supra*, pp. 10, 12 and chap. xi

far as I can get any good by it; I malign every man of a different opinion from those whom I serve: I bring my loyalty to market.' Such loyalty has borne higher or lower prices, according to the different periods of modern times. He [the Orangeman] exposes it for sale in open market, at all times, seeking continually for a purchaser." The price demanded for this pinchbeck loyalty, by the Orange society's rules of 1800, was expressed in the following terms:

"I, A.B., do solemnly and sincerely swear, of my own free will and accord, that I will, to the utmost of my power, support and defend the present King, George the Third, his heirs and successors, *so long as he or they support the Protestant ascendency.*"[30]

"He who serves queens may expect backsheesh." Thus speaks Darkush in Disraeli's *Tancred*. Orangemen stipulated, and still stipulate, for backsheesh as a condition previous to service. The upset price which they placed on their conditional allegiance in 1800 was a distinctly high one, as may be seen by reference to the definite meaning attached at the close of the last century to the words "Protestant ascendency." It was clearly explained in a manifesto issued in 1792 by the Protestant Lord Mayor, sheriffs, commons, and citizens of Dublin to their co-religionists in Ireland. It is given in a work by the Orange writer, Musgrave, and contains the following lines:

"And that no doubt may remain of what we understand by the words *Protestant ascendency*, we have further resolved that we consider the Protestant ascendency to consist in:

"A Protestant King of Ireland,

"A Protestant Parliament,

"A Protestant Hierarchy,

"Protestant electors and Government;

"The benches of justice,

"The army and the revenue,

"Through all their branches and details, Protestant;

"And this supported by a connexion with the Protestant realm of Great Britain."[31]

Orangeman, briefly, bound themselves by a solemn oath, taken on their knees, not to exchange their "loyalty" at a less price than the following:

1. A strict and *perpetual* monopoly of place, power, and pelf

[30] Appendix to *Report* of Parliamentary Committee (Irish) of 1835 on Orange lodges.

[31] Musgrave, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, Appendix, p. 12. Cf. Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, pp. 261, *sqq*. For the meaning then, and even still, attached to the word "Protestant" in Ireland, see p. 86, *supra*.

for themselves and their co-religionists. This included a monopoly of the electoral roll; of the making and administration of the law; of the army, navy, and civil service; and generally, of every position of honour and emolument in the State. These conditions of sale necessarily involved the following:

2. That the penal laws should be kept in force against their Catholic fellow-countrymen till the end of time; that all Catholics *and Dissenters*—that is to say, over five-sixths of the population—should be deprived of a place on the electoral roll, and on the bench; denied any share whatever in the making or administration of the law; and be absolutely excluded from every office of honour or emolument under the State: their chief use, to pay taxes, to furnish funds for Orange placemen, to be helots and serfs, hewers of wood and drawers of water, in their own land, until the crack of doom.

Conditions such as these would turn Ireland into an Orange El Dorado, where a very small investment of "loyalty" would bring in wholesale returns of power, place, and shining shekels, guaranteed in perpetuity by the State. Such conditions exist, to a certain extent, in the two chief centres of Irish Orangeism —Belfast and Derry—where the brethren and their co-religionists enjoy practically a monopoly of positions of emolument in the gift of public bodies, and where Catholics have been, almost up to the present hour, systematically deprived of some of the benefits of the Emancipation Act. Nevertheless, the Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the great riots of 1857, 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886, have failed to find that the Orange brethren of Belfast and Derry have been at any time conspicuous for either patriotism or loyalty. In Derry city, in 1891, the Catholic population numbered 18,346; the Protestants, 14,860; yet, owing to the fact that the registration and revision of voters' lists are largely in the hands of officials who are, themselves, either Orangemen or of most pronounced Orange sympathies, Catholics have been excluded, almost to the present hour, from representation in the Corporation, and from any participation in salaried offices that are in the gift of its elective public bodies. An almost exactly similar state of things has existed at Belfast, where the Catholics were in 1891 over a fourth (26.3 per cent.) of the population.[32] These two hoary public scandals existed until the close of 1896, when Parliament at last passed special Acts for the purpose of giving members of the proscribed creed in the two chief centres of Orange activity some small voice in the Corporations, and of putting a limit to a traditional exhibition of intolerance such

[32] See Appendix A, *infra*.

as is happily quite unknown in the portions of Ireland where Catholics are in the ascendent. Orangemen undoubtedly lay themselves open to the charge of making their association the means of securing for themselves an undue share of the loaves and fishes that are in the gift of the State or of elective public bodies. In the course of the eighth chapter extracts have been given to show that the narrow and exclusive spirit which prevails in Derry and Belfast has found an echo in the Orange press and on the Orange platform in Australia.[33] Reference to the seventh chapter of this book will show that there is, perhaps, no class of members of the institution so open to the suspicion of axe-grinding as the politicians of the order.[34] The following extract from the *Report* of the English Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 will give some idea of the extent to which even the rank and file of Orangemen have regarded the society as a means of personal advancement: "It appears by the correspondence [of the Grand Lodge] that the institution has been considered by some Orangemen as a source of patronage, and there are various applications from the brethren for the influence and assistance of the dignitaries of the Imperial Grand Lodge (which influence and assistance appear frequently to have been used) to procure licenses for public-houses, pensions in the artillery, and situations in the police and in the docks; and these applications appear to have increased to such an extent that the Deputy Grand Secretary intimates in the printed circular of the proceedings of the Imperial Lodge, held on the 16th April, 1833, 'that the duties of the Deputy Grand Secretary are so irksome and onerous as compels him [*sic*] to notify that his labours will not admit the additional toils imposed by applications for patronage and places, which are pouring in upon him daily. To so oppressive an extent have such importunities been carried as to be sufficient to engross the whole attention of one individual to read (far less to investigate the merits of) memorials and petitions, with the prayers of which neither the illustrious Grand Master nor the Deputy Grand Master has the power of complying.'" Miss Martineau tells how even clergymen were invited by circular to join the association, *because their doing so might lead to patronage and preferment.*[35]

The old cry of "Protestant ascendency" is not even yet quite dead. It was kept up by the Irish lodges—mingled with seditious threats to the Queen—until the Disestablishment Bill was passed in 1869. To this day such allegiance as

[33] See chap. viii., *supra*, pp. 162-163, and preface.

[34] See pp. 134, *sqq.*

[35] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 274. Cf. Irish *Report*, Qq. 3536-3537.

Orangemen offer to the throne is conditional on the Queen and her successors "being Protestant"[36]—in the Orange sense of the word; for the reader has already seen, in the course of the fifth chapter, that mere belief in the Thirty-nine Articles, or in the Westminster Confession, is not sufficient to constitute Protestantism as it is understood in the lodges.[37] Orangemen, then, not only demand a price, or condition, for their allegiance to the Throne; but their oath or declaration of loyalty is so worded as to indicate in them a frame of mind which, in given and very possible circumstances, is ever ripe for another and, perhaps, not very "glorious revolution." The Cumberland conspiracy was a case in point. Detailed reference to it will be found in the closing chapter of this volume.

A STORY FOR THE MARINES.

Briefly: No one acquainted with the early history of the Orange movement will pretend that either a law-abiding or a religious spirit was the motive of its foundation, or of the wild orgie of plunder, wrecking, and bloodshed with which it was inaugurated. It would be a severe strain upon our faith to ask us to believe that loyalty was the guiding motive of the actions of a violent mob, composed of the lowest orders in Armagh county in 1795, who were variously described by Protestant officials, statesmen, and writers, in such terms as the following:[38] "Crowds of miscreants," "the very scum of society, and a disgrace to Protestantism," "a lawless banditti," "a banditti of murderers," "a banditti of plundering ruffians," "a violent mob," "an ungovernable mob," "insurgents," "northern rebels whose barbarity exceeded that of modern times, and brought back the recollection of ancient ferocity and bloodshed," etc. The early Orangemen were not exactly the class of men to whom we should look for a high degree of loyal submission to law, or of allegiance to the head of the State. It matters not what view the reader may take as to the aggressive or defensive attitude of the Peep-o'-Day Boys, or of the first Orangemen, at or before the so-called "battle" of the Diamond—to them as bloodless as a French duel, to the Defender party so sanguinary. No sane person will hint, and no writer—Orange or otherwise—that I am acquainted with, has hinted that the "papering," intimidation, house-wrecking, arson, plunder, persecution, bloodshed, and extermination of the Catholics of Armagh county by the first Orangemen, had their source in loyalty—in respect for law or order, or in regard

[36] See ritual and Rules in Appendices B and C.
[37] Pp. 99-101, *supra*.
[38] See pp. 61-63.

for the constitutional, or even natural, rights of their fellow-citizens. Only the most extreme partisan of the lodges will venture to contend that the outrages of the Orange processionists of a later day, their defiance of proclamations, Acts of Parliament, and violent resistance to the forces of the Crown, are evidence of their conspicuous loyalty. On such matters there can be practically no dispute. Here, then, I part company with the rude rank and file of the lodges of a later day, as well as with the "lawless banditti" and the "scum of society" that first bore the name of Orangemen. I now fly for higher game, and come to three highly select sections of the Orange body, namely:

1. The Orange soldiery, and especially the yeomanry, who were enrolled, armed, and paid by Government to (ostensibly at least) "support and defend to the utmost of their power" the laws and Constitution of their country.

2. Orange magistrates and jurymen, whose duty it was and is to administer even-handed justice according to law.

3. The officers of the institution, and more especially the members of Grand Lodge, who had, and have, supreme control over the membership and policy of the Orange society.

Assuming Orange professions of loyalty to be sincere, the position of these three classes of members, and the nature of their duties, would entitle us to expect from them, of all others, quite an exceptional degree of dutiful subjection to law, order, and constituted authority, and a deep, devoted, and unfailing attachment to the person of the Sovereign of the realm.

In dealing with the question of lodge loyalty, one naturally turns to the Orangeism of Ulster as the model and exemplar of the true spirit and practice of the association. In Ulster Orangeism arose. There, amidst congenial surroundings, it reached its highest development. It has existed there ever since 1795. The days of its first glory are over, but Orangemen throughout the world still look to Ulster, as the pious Moslem turns his head to the East. Armagh is the cradle of their institution; Belfast is its capital; Derry its holy city. Ulster Orangeism may be fairly taken as a test and earnest of what its Australasian offshoots may, under favouring circumstances, come to be. The reader has already seen that the Canadian association has proved itself a worthy child of the parent from which it sprung.

Chapter XIII.

LOYALTY OF THE ORANGE SOCIETY—ORANGE SOLDIERY: "THE GALLANT ORANGE YEOMANRY." —MARTIAL LAW, FREE-QUARTERS, AND OTHER "WELL-TIMED MEASURES"—THE GENTLE SEX: LOYALIST V. REBEL GALLANTRY—THE ORANGE INQUISITION AND ITS WAYS—HOW REBELS WERE MADE—THE REIGN OF TERROR; THE REIGN OF LAW; THE REIGN OF PEACE.

ONE of the heavy-fisted, blood-letting old Ossianic heroes called to his bard:

"Sing me a song: a song
With a sword in every line."

This spirit of strife finds an echo in some of the books of songs and ballads that are issued for the use of Orangemen. Almost every page of them smells rank of blood and slaughter. Several lodge "poets" found a theme to inspire their limping measures in the shocking massacre committed by armed Orangemen at Dolly's Brae, in 1849, while the stricken people were still reeling from the effects of the great famine.[1] Another bard devotes six verses to the glories of "the gallant Orange yeomanry," who fought in the insurrection of 1798.[2] The first and fourth stanzas run as follow:

AIR: "*Partant pour la Syrie.*"

"I am an humble Orangeman—
My father he was one;
The mantle which the sire once wore
Has fallen to his son:
He ranked with those who quelled their foes—
The foes of Church and State—
The gallant Orange Yeomanry
Who fought in Ninety-eight!

. . . . . .

[1] See chap. xi., *supra*, pp. 222-225. Two verses of the song on Dolly's Brae are given in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 231. Grand Chaplain Drew termed the massacre a "victory." *Ibid.*, p. 230. Another rhymster sings the glories of Dolly's Brae, with the inspiring refrain, "Derry down, down, down, Derry down," in the *Victorian Standard*, April 30, 1897.

[2] From a volume of Orange songs, etc., edited by D. G. M. William Johnston of Ballykilbeg.

"To guard the faith which Luther preached—
The rights which William won,
The Orangeman relies upon
His Bible and his gun.[3]
He prays for peace, yet war will face,
Should rebels congregate;
Like the brave Orange Yeomanry
Who fought in Ninety-eight."

Such is the Orange yeoman of the lodge poet. The purpose of this chapter is to see him as he was in life; to find out how far a sense of religion, of loyalty to the State, of dutiful obedience to its laws, were the guiding motives of his conduct in the days of peace, as well as in the stirring times of war.

The Irish yeomanry forces, long since disbanded, played in their day a leading, if not an altogether creditable, part in the drama of the social and political life of their country. This force was organised in the end of 1796, under the following ominous circumstances:

1. The extermination policy of the early Orange lodges had not as yet spent its first fury in Armagh, Tyrone, and the neighbouring counties. The North was, mainly in consequence of these outrages, in a state of great disturbance.

2. Government had entered upon a policy which, in the words of Lecky, was "strongly anti-Catholic."[4] (*a*) Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform had been definitely refused. (*b*) Steps were being taken to effect Pitt's pet project of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. The two first-named measures could not for long be safely refused, nor could the third be easily carried, in the face of a nation so strong in its unity of creeds and classes as Ireland was at the fateful period when the foundation of the first Orange lodge was laid in blood.

3. The policy of the Government required that the growing union between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland should be replaced by a strife of creeds or parties. This was an indispensable condition of success. Hence, as the contemporary historian, Plowden, remarks, "great efforts were made [by the Government] to foster the soreness of the Catholics, and to inflame the differences between the Protestants and them."

[3] This line recalls Cromwell's advice to his soldiers, when crossing a river in Ireland: "Put your trust in God, but mind to keep your powder dry." Colonel Blacker (mentioned in chap. iii., *supra*) wrote an Orange song with Cromwell's words as a refrain. *Irish Minstrelsy*, p. 326 ("Canterbury Poets" Series).

[4] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 473.

Pitt's project of a Legislative Union would, moreover, have been notably facilitated by an unsuccessful rebellion in Ireland. He, therefore, took effective measures to provoke it. The reader will see, as we proceed, that the Orange yeomanry were his chief instruments in goading the people into insurrection.

4. The elements of disunion and sectarian strife lay ready and waiting among the lodge brethren who, ever since September 21, 1795, had been carrying on a war of wholesale proscription against the Catholic population in Armagh, Tyrone, and the counties round about. The Government of the day entered into relations with the Orangemen in the following ways:

(*a*) By conniving at, or (as Lord Altamont and others declared at the time) *directly encouraging* the Orange outrages in Ulster.[5]

(*b*) By supplying the brethren with money and arms. This had begun as early as the spring of 1796,[6] while the Orangemen were in the full career of their early outrages on the Catholic population of the North.

THE LODGES UNDER ARMS.

The formal enrolment of the yeomanry took place in the end of 1796. Three features of the movement are deserving of particular attention, namely:

1. The enrolment was carried out principally in Ulster;[7]

2. Those enrolled in the yeomanry corps were mostly Orangemen;

3. This "alliance" (as Lecky terms it) between the Government and the Orange party "added greatly to the anarchy of the North, and had ultimately a most serious influence on the remainder of Ireland,"[8] which was at the time in a comparatively peaceful state.[9]

Under the favouring smile of the Government, country gentlemen now began to join the hitherto discredited Orange association. This accession of fresh blood to its ranks, however, effected no change in the violent and distinctively anti-Catholic character of the society. It still, says Lecky, "included in its ranks all the most intolerant and fanatical Protestantism of the province [of Ulster], and it inherited from its earlier stage traditions and habits of violence and

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., pp. 441, 446, etc.

[6] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 69-70. One of the printed resolutions of a meeting of Orangemen in the town of Armagh declared that the two guineas per man allowed them by the Government were not sufficient to purchase clothes and accoutrements.

[7] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 474.

[8] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 47. See also chap. ii., *supra*, p. 26, *note* 54.

[9] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 474. See also chap. ii., *supra*, pp. 24-25.

outrage, which its new leaders could not wholly suppress, and which the anarchy of the time was well fitted to encourage."[10]

The situation was still further aggravated by the following fact: The undisciplined factionists, now armed, paid, and "let loose," as Lecky says, upon the homes of Ulster, were for the most part members of the very organisation (the Orange society) which was at that moment, and had been for over a year beforehand, engaged in a furious persecution of Catholics, such as, according to Lecky, had never been known in Ireland since the days of Cromwell.[11] The early Ulster yeomanry, says the same Protestant writer, consisted "to a large extent of the most violent Protestants," who "had been inflamed to the highest pitch of animosity against their Catholic fellow-countrymen."[12] Lord Downshire, who was engaged in enrolling the new force near Newry, wrote to the Government that the yeoman infantry "are chiefly Orangemen, and all agree in not admitting a Papist, however recommended."[13] From the very beginning the force was, according to Lecky, "largely composed of men with Orange sympathies."[14] Some large bodies of yeomanry were made up exclusively of avowed Orangemen.[15] The Orange writer, Musgrave, says that "in the counties of Fermanagh, Tyrone, Derry, and Armagh, there were 14,000 yeomen, and most of them Orangemen."[16] In his *Strictures* on

[10] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 49. Referring to its "new leaders" Plowden says that several magistrates who had "connived at and encouraged" the Armagh outrages, "were rewarded with commands in the yeomanry corps." *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 63.

[11] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 446.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 473.

[13] Quoted by Lecky, *ibid.* Lord Downshire says "their *condition of service* is, that no Papist should be enrolled with them" (*ibid.*). A few Catholics at first joined the ranks, and Catholics in the South and West, during the French invasion scare, formed Volunteer corps to meet the temporary need. The enlistment of Catholics in the Government yeomanry forces was, however, from the first distinctly discouraged. Some Catholics waited on Secretary Pelham, the friend of the Armagh Orange wreckers, and requested permission to form a Catholic yeomanry corps. Permission was refused: they were told to join the Protestant corps then in course of formation. The reluctance with which the few Catholic yeomen were received, coupled with the Orange and violently anti-Catholic character of the new force, deterred members of the persecuted creed generally from joining (Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 70). In the circumstances, it is no wonder that, as Lecky says, the Catholic Committee strongly discouraged their co-religionists from enlisting (*Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, iii., 473). A few Catholic yeomen, however, remained and fought during the insurrection (*ibid.*, iv., 331, 337). In Wexford they were disarmed and disgraced (Mitchel *Hist Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxv).

[14] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 48.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[16] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, p. 194.

Plowden (p. 155) he says the Orangemen from the very first "formed by far the most considerable part of the yeomanry." Plowden, likewise a contemporary writer, says that the yeomanry corps (except that of the lawyers) were "composed of the most active and prominent members of the society of Orangemen," and that "by far the greatest and most mischievous part" of that force belonged to the same association.[17] Referring to the period immediately preceding the insurrection of 1798, the Protestant historian Walpole says that the yeomanry "was composed almost entirely of Orangemen."[18] Froude—who is as violent a partisan of the Orange society as was Musgrave—states that "by the spring of 1797 they could place twenty thousand men at the disposition of the authorities. In 1798 they filled the ranks of the yeomanry."[19] According to a return presented to Parliament by Lord Castlereagh just after the Act of Union was passed, the various yeomanry corps in Ireland, in the year 1800, numbered 53,557 men.

NINETY-EIGHT.

I. In the Irish mind, the Orange yeomanry will be ever chiefly associated with the part they took in first provoking, and afterwards suppressing, the memorable insurrection of 1798. The course of this chapter will show how far in this, as in subsequent events up to the date of their supression, their conduct was consistent with a loyal submission to law or constituted authority, or with a due regard for the legal and natural rights of their "Roman Catholic brethren." The history of that dark period of crime and woe has brought into clear light the three following facts:

1. The promoting of this abortive rising was not merely the predicted and calculated effect of Pitt's Irish policy. It was its set and deliberate purpose.

2. The insurrection of 1798 was but a means to a further end: namely, to smooth the way towards effecting the great purpose of Pitt's later years, the securing of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

3. The Orange yeomanry were the chief instruments in the crime of goading the people into insurrection. Painful as must be the tale of the slow and uniform agony of a people, in every true history of the Orange yeomanry such a tale must hold a conspicuous place.

Writing of Pitt's Irish policy, the Protestant Unionist historian, Lecky, says: "*The steady object of his* (Pitt's) *later*

[17] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 70, 73.
[18] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xvii p. 467.
[19] *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., pp. 178-179 (ed. 1887).

Irish policy was to corrupt and to degrade, in order that he ultimately might destroy, the Legislature of the country. . . . By raising the hopes of the Catholics almost to certainty, and then dashing them to the ground, by taking this step at the very moment when the inflammatory spirit engendered by the [French] Revolution had begun to spread among the people, Pitt sowed in Ireland the seeds of discord and bloodshed, of religious animosities and social disorganisation, which paralysed the energies of the country aud rendered possible the success of his machinations. *The rebellion of 1798, with all the accumulated miseries it entailed, was the direct and predicted consequence of his policy.* Lord Fitzwilliam had solemnly warned the Government that to disappoint the hopes of the Catholics 'would be to raise a flame in the country that nothing but the force of arms could keep down.' Lord Charlemont, though on principle opposed to the Catholic claims, declared that the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam would be ruinous to Ireland, and foretold that by the following Christmas the people might be in the hands of the United Irishmen."[20]

Sir Jonah Barrington, a member of the ascendency party, bears similar testimony. Writing of the insurrection of 1798, he says: "Mr. Pitt's end was answered. He thus[21] raised the Catholics to the height of expectation, and by suddenly recalling their favourite Viceroy he inflamed them to the degree of generating the commotions he meditated, which would throw the Protestants into the arms of England for protection, whilst the horrors would be aggravated by the mingled conflict of parties."[22] A little further on in the same work he writes: "Mr. Pitt, having sent Lord Fitzwilliam to Ireland, with unlimited powers to satisfy the nation, permitted him to proceed until he had unavoidably committed himself both to the Catholics and the country, when he suddenly recalled him, leaving it in a state of excitement and dismay. The day Lord Fitzwilliam arrived, peace was proclaimed throughout all Ireland; the day he quitted it she prepared for insurrection. . . . Within three months after Lord Fitzwilliam's dismissal, Lord Clare had *got the nation into training for military execution*"[23] "Mr. Pitt," says the same author, "counted on the expertness of the Irish Government to effect a premature explosion. Free quarters were now ordered, to irritate the Irish population. SLOW TORTURES were inflicted under the

[20] Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion*, ed. 1871, pp. 146-147.

[21] By sending Lord Fitzwilliam to Ireland as Viceroy, with a promise of Catholic Emancipation.

[22] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, ed. 1844, pp. 345-346.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 346-347.

pretence of forcing confessions. The people were goaded and driven to madness. . . . Mr. Pitt's object was now effected, and an insurrection was excited."[24]

At the examination of Dr. McNevin in 1798, Lord Castlereagh remarked: "You acknowledge the Union [United Irish Society] would have been stronger *but for the means taken to make it explode.*"[25]

Lord Camden, who succeeded Lord Fitzwilliam as Viceroy, and who carried out the policy of forcing the people into insurrection, admitted in the House of Lords that "the measures of the Government caused the rebellion to break out sooner than it otherwise would."[26] The Secret Committee of the House of Lords, which subsequently inquired into all the circumstances of the rising, said in their *Report:* "It appears from a variety of evidence laid before your Committee that the rebellion would not have broken out as soon as it did, had it not been for the well-timed measures adopted by the Government."[27] The chief measures referred to were the following:

1. Putting into operation the provisions of the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts. These Acts conferred on magistrates unlimited powers to search houses for arms, to arrest, imprison, or transport men on board tenders, without any proper form of trial. The justices were, moreover, protected by the Indemnity Act from the consequences of such outrages and illegalities as they had committed, or might in future commit. These Acts were passed, as Grattan said in the Irish House of Commons, "to legalise outrage, to barbarise law, and to give the law itself the cast and colour of outrage."[28]

2. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. When this took place, "Ireland," says Mitchel, "stood utterly stripped naked of all law and government."[29] There was likewise a Curfew Act.[30]

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 351. The capitals are Barrington's.
[25] McNevin, *Pieces of Irish History*, p. 203.
[26] Quoted in *The Truth about Ninety-eight*, London, 1886, p. 8.
[27] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 289.
[28] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxix., p. 226.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] The Curfew Act required people, under penalty, to be in their houses and to have all lights extinguished soon after sunset every night. Lights were not permitted to persons watching with the sick. The Orange yeomanry and other troops, by their nightly raids, their burning of cottages, and their habit of calling people to their doors and shooting them, made it unsafe to comply with the first provision of the Curfew Act mentioned above. At the same time they punished the violation of it with burning, torture, or death. The following is from a proclamation by General Derham in Belfast, *prior to the insurrection:* "This is to give notice, that in

3. The proclamation of martial law, and the placing of military at free quarters among the people. These were, of all others, the special "well-timed measures" referred to in the *Report* of the Secret Committee. They resulted in the outbreak of outrage, torture, and bloodshed, which drove the unhappy people into the ill-starred insurrection of 1798. In the midst of these scenes we frequently come across the Orangeman with a uniform on his back, and a flintlock in his hand. It will be interesting, as well as instructive, to watch his conduct under arms. The ordinary Tommy Atkins is required, as a sheer matter of course, to obey the civil law, *plus* the military regulations. He does not rave upon the stage about his loyalty, but is satisfied to prove it by his fidelity to the quiet duties of barrack or camp, and by his bravery on the blood-stained field. The Orange yeoman boasted of his loyalty quite as much as the Orange civilian. Assuming his professions to have been sincere, we should look to him for a signal display of devotion to law and authority, and to the Sacred Word of Truth, which it was ever his chief duty to maintain. His corps was practically an Orange lodge—a picked body of *sworn* loyalists—held in the iron grip of military regulations. His officers were frequently the *élite* of the Purple Order, with power, not merely to expel for the high crime of "marrying a Papist," but also to compel respect to civil law, and obedience to military regulations, by the gentle suasion of the triangle and the cat-o'-nine tails. Such a combination of circumstances ought to have made the Irish Orange yeomanry models of every soldierly grace and virtue, the joy of their officers, the pride of Parliament and the nation—in a word, uniformed embodiments of the "qualifications of an Orangeman."

CHIEF ACTORS IN THE TRAGEDY.

It is the misfortune, if not the fault, of the Orange soldiery, that they have left few traces of their virtues in the period of which I write. Their vices, on the other hand, were many, and worked in deep grooves, which have left their mark upon their country's history to this day. The worst terrors of this dark period of crime and woe will be ever chiefly associated in the Irish mind with the names of the following military organisations:

1. The Orange yeomanry;
2. The Welsh regiment known as the Ancient Britons:

---

any person is taken up by the patrols after ten o'clock, he will be fined five shillings for the benefit of the poor. If the delinquent is not able to pay five shillings, he will be brought to a drum-head court-martial, *and will receive one hundred lashes.*—James Derham, *Colonel-Commandant.*"

3. The North Cork militia,[31] and certain Ulster militia regiments;

4. Two regiments of German troops from Hesse.

THE YEOMANRY.

1. Evidence has already been adduced to show that, before the insurrection of 1798, the Irish yeomanry corps were mostly composed of Orangemen. In Wexford county, however, eighteen months before the outbreak, Catholics had loyally united with their Protestant fellow-citizens in forming yeomanry corps for the defence of the country against the attempted French invasion of December, 1796.[32] According to their papers, Wexford county was never "organised" by the United Irishmen.[33] Its name does not appear in the list of "places to be relied upon," drawn up by Lord Edward Fitzgerald in February, 1798. Nevertheless, Catholics and liberal-minded Protestants were driven from the yeomanry there. As a result, the force in question "became almost exclusively Protestant."[34] Thenceforward, says Myles Byrne in his *Memoirs*, the Wexford yeomanry were to be "upon the *true* Protestant, or Orange system." They were recruited mainly from the same class as the yeomanry of Ulster, and of the neighbouring county of Wicklow. Hay, in his *History of the Insurrection in Wexford*, describes them as the "lowest and most uninformed vulgar."

[31] Lecky says: "The North Cork militia, the Welsh regiment of Ancient Britons, and two Hessian regiments, which were sent over just before the rebellion, appear to have been those which left the most bitter recollections in Ireland" (*Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 275; cf. p. 343). His statements regarding the Orange yeomanry place them amongst the most furious persecutors of the people at this period (vide *infra*). Mitchel describes the Hessian troops as "German mercenaries . . . who had for some time been favourite instruments of the British Government for dragooning any refractory population" (*Hist. Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxii., p. 266).

[32] Mitchel, *History of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxiv.

[33] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xx., p. 489. Nothing, certainly, appears to have been done to impart military training, appoint officers, form regiments, etc. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv.. p. 345, *note*. This is confirmed by Hay and Gordon. See Kavanagh's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, Appendix, 4th ed., p. 261, *note*. Mitchel says of the Wexford insurrection that "scarcely any of its leaders were United Irishmen," and that Father John Murphy and the other clergymen who took part in it "had done their utmost to break up that society, in some cases even refusing the sacraments to those who were members." *History of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxv., p. 303.

[34] Lecky, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 346. By directions from Dublin Castle, the Wexford yeomanry—or some corps of them—were (nominally) required to take an oath that they were neither United Irishmen *nor Orangemen*, "but practically," says Mitchel, "the measure was so executed as to disarm none but Catholics, or such Protestants as were known to be liberal in their opinions," *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxiv., p. 282.

They were largely controlled by what one contemporary author terms an "Orange magistracy," whose harsh treatment of the Catholic population is admitted by a local and contemporary Protestant historian, Rev. James Gordon.[35] Sir Jonah Barrington, who was at that period an Orangemen,[36] says: "A portion of the gentry of the county of Wexford were boisterous, overbearing, and devoid of judgment. Their Christian principles were merged in their Protestant ascendency. The frenzy of an exterminating principle seemed to have taken root amongst them; and they acted as if under the impression that burning every cottage, and torturing every cottager, were a meritorious proof of their faith and loyalty."[37] This was before the insurrection. The head-quarters of the various corps of Wexford yeomanry were at Wexford, Enniscorthy, Ferns, and Gorey. In each of these places, previous to the outbreak of the insurrection, they were associated with the North Cork militia, who, as we shall see, were ardent proselytisers for the Orange association. The Protestant writer Taylor is compelled to admit that, at the outbreak of hostilities in 1798, there were Orangemen in the towns where the detachments of the North Cork militia were stationed.[38] Hay, another contemporary historian, says that many, "finding themselves supported by the military," now joined the Orange association, and—following the Ulster custom—wore its colours.[39] Hunter Gowan,

[35] *Hist. of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 360. Lecky admits that "some of the Wexford magistrates obtained during the rebellion, and in the weeks of martial law that preceded it, a reputation for extreme violence." *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 343. Cf. Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxiv., p. 287; chap. xxxv., p. 297; and Hay, *Hist. of the Insurrection*, pp. 61-63.

[36] See p. 1, *supra*, *note* 1.

[37] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, 2nd ed., p. 353.

[38] *History of the Rebellion in the County of Wexford*, p. 15. The author, a clergyman, habitually applies to Catholics the offensive designation of "Papists." An idea of the extremely partisan character of his little book may be gained from the fact that it has been republished at the office of the *Victorian Standard*, and advertised in that paper in the same column with *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk*, for circulation among the Orange lodges of the colony. Taylor's references to "priest Murphy," "priest Kearns," etc., are quite in the style affected by the Orange press.

[39] *Hist. of the Insurrection*, ed. 1803, p. 57. The custom of Orangemen and *Nationalists* wearing distinctive colours (orange and green) was in vogue in Ulster in 1797 (cf. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, iv., 98). The custom had found its way to Wexford county before the insurrection, both among the militia and the yeomanry. At the battle of Enniscorthy, May 28, 1798, *two days* after the rising, when the fortunes of the fight fluctuated in favour of the *yeomen*, "many in the town," says Lecky, are said to have displayed *orange* ribbons; when the insurgents prevailed, *green* ribbons (the national colour) were exhibited (Lecky, *ibid.*, p. 359). This statement is made by other historians, and is borne out by well attested and constant local tradition. Taylor, the local Protestant writer already quoted, states in his

for instance, and his Black Mob, marched through the town of Gorey displaying "all the devices of Orangemen."[40] "The society," he continues, "soon after became prevalent throughout the county," and "was forwarded by the received prejudice that no man could be loyal who was not an Orangeman. Dr. Jacob, a captain of a yeomanry corps, did not at first deem Orangeism an essential to loyalty, and refused to become a member, but he was soon induced to alter his opinion. By a resolution entered into by a majority of the corps, *that they would resign if he did not join the association*, they absolutely compelled the captain to take the oath." Hay, Byrne, Cloney, Mitchel, and others unite in describing the most ferocious of the Wexford yeomanry as being Orangemen just before and during the insurrection; and in the popular mind at that period they were regarded as such.[41] After the capture of Wexford, as also at Vinegar Hill and elsewhere, the insurgents carefully distinguished between other Protestants, whom they spared, and those who "were known as Orangemen," or who (as Lecky says), after a "form of trial," "were pronounced by the rebel tribunals to be Orangemen."[42]

Rebellion in the County of Wexford (p. 36. Dublin: Curry, 1829) that the town was defended by the Enniscorthy and Scarawalsh yeomanry and by fifty men of the North Cork militia. Two or three days after the capture of Enniscorthy (May 30th and 31st, 1798), when Wexford had also fallen into the hands of the insurgents, the inhabitants hung out green; "but," says Lecky (iv., 369) "banners of all colours, *except the hated orange*, now appeared." A further instance of the fury excited in the popular mind by supposed Orange emblems is given by the same writer (iv., 453). Even at this early period the people of Wexford had learned to hate the Orange colour.

[40] Hay, *Hist. of the Insurrection*, p. 70; cf. pp. 272, 278.

[41] Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 347, 351; Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxiv.

[42] Mitchel, *ibid.*, chap. xxxv., p. 296; cf. Lecky, vol. iv., pp. 369, 381. Cf. Hay's *Hist. of the Insurrection*, Appendix X. Musgrave, perhaps unintentionally, contributed evidence that in Wexford the popular resentment was directed mainly against Orangemen. He gives the following as a copy of a certificate or passport signed by a Catholic priest of the town: "A of B, in the parish of C, has done his duty, and proved himself a Roman Catholic, and has made a voluntary oath that he never was an Orangeman, nor took the Orange oath. F. J. Broe, *Dated, Wexford, June 21, 1798.*" Another proof of the resentment of the insurgents against Orangemen is furnished by the same writer in the case of Thomas Hall (*Memoirs* Appendix xix., No. 14, vol. ii., p. 120, ed. 1801). His alleged *Journal* of Father Murphy would furnish further proof in point, but that it is so manifestly a hoax or a forgery (cf. Gordon's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 2nd ed., p. 412). Kavanagh, in his *Hist. of the Rebellion* (4th ed., p. 161), shows that the fury of the insurgents was directed chiefly against Orangemen. Cf. Hay, p. 59. Gordon relates how, in Wicklow county, Orangemen, or persons charged with being Orangemen, were singled out for special vengeance by the insurgents. Lecky, iv., 443; cf. p. 451. The many Quakers settled in the disturbed districts in Wexford county were not molested in any way.

In the neighbouring county of Wicklow, says Lecky, it became necessary "to fill the ranks [of the yeomanry] with Protestants of the lowest order." Hence the organisation there took "a peculiarly sectarian character."[43] The Wicklow yeomanry were associated with the *Antrim* militia,[44] and with the Ancient Britons, who, as we shall in due course see, were "mostly Orangemen." Miles Byrne, in his *Memoirs*, expressly states that the Wicklow yeomanry were Orangemen, and as such they were held to be in the public estimation.[45] In his *Memoirs*,[46] Musgrave records the singularly precise rumor prevalent in the Rathdrum district (Wicklow county) that all but four members of the local yeomanry corps were Orangemen. Their *confrères* of the adjoining county of Carlow, as well as those of Meath and Kildare, are described by the Protestant writer, Walpole, as being "Orange yeomanry corps," just before the insurrection broke out in 1798.[47] The Carlow yeomanry were associated in the work of provoking the rebellion with portion of the North Cork militia and the Tyrone militia. The latter were in the habit of "wearing ostentatiously Orange ribbons among the Catholic peasantry, and plundering alike the loyal and disloyal."[48]

THE ANCIENT BRITONS.

2. Early in the year 1797, the Ancient Britons were stationed at Newry, in the heart of one of the most Orange districts of the North. The Newry Orange yeomanry had

[43] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 342.

[44] Despatch of Lord Camden, May 26, 1798, given by Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxiii., p. 281.

[45] Cf. Lecky, *loc. cit.*, and p. 347. Taylor's statement that there was no Orange *organisation* in Wicklow county at the outbreak of hostilities, is quite opposed to the probabilities of the case, and cannot set aside the popular verdict and the positive statement of Byrne and other contemporary writers. As events proved, the rumour of a massacre by Orange yeomanry was not, unhappily, altogether devoid of foundation. There is, on the other hand, no evidence to show that the Wicklow yeomanry, unlike their *confrères*, stood aloof from the Orange organisation. General Sir John Moore, speaking of Wicklow, says the people there "would certainly be quiet if the *gentry and yeomen* would only behave with tolerable decency, and not seek to gratify their ill-humor and revenge upon the poor." Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxiii., p. 272. See also *Cornwallis Correspondence*, vol. ii., pp. 385-386, Murray's ed., 1859.

[46] Vol. i., p. 306.

[47] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xix, p. 487. *The Irish Magazine* of 1811 credits the Carlow Orangemen with the chief share in the tortures inflicted on the people in that county in 1798. Quoted in Kavanagh's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 4th ed., p. 261.

[48] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 275; cf. vol. iii., p. 464, and Mitchel's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxiii., p. 279. Cf. *note* 39, *supra*.

their head-quarters in the same town, and the two forces seem to have cordially fraternised, at least in crime. In May of that year—twelve months before the rebellion—the Newry yeomanry and the Ancient Britons joined hand in hand in the shocking and wholly unprovoked massacre of inoffensive men, women, and children at Ballyholan. This event, says Lecky, "left an ineffaceable impression of horror and resentment on the popular mind."[49] Judging from their associations, and the eager propaganda of Orangeism which we know was soon afterwards carried on in English militia regiments in and out of Ireland, it was but natural to expect that, as Plowden positively states, the Ancient Britons were "mostly Orangemen," and that they were given to Orange toasts over their cups.[50] They were placed at free quarters among the hapless peasantry of Wicklow before the insurrection of 1798, and vied with the local yeomanry and the Antrim militia in the perpetration of the maddening atrocities which finally sent the people out of their homes to sell their lives upon the hillsides.[51]

THE NORTH CORK MILITIA.

3. The North Cork militia were under the ominous leadership of Lord Kingsborough. He was the friend of the notorious Orange Grand Secretary, John Claudius Beresford, and his accomplice in the inhuman tortures inflicted by the latter on the unhappy people previous to the outbreak of hostilities in 1798.[52] Lord Kingsborough had evidently to a

[49] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 274-275; cf. p. 99. A description of this massacre, from the pen of an Orange eye-witness, is given in this chapter, *infra*.

[50] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 91, 96. Plowden says that at this time (1797) "by far the greater part of the Newry cavalry and infantry yeomen were also Orangemen" (*ibid.*, p. 92). The same writer gives (*ibid.*, pp. 115-118) an instance of Orangemen proselytising among the Cambridgeshire militia, together with a copy of a regimental order by its commanding officer, the Earl of Hardwicke, strictly forbidding his officers and men to join the society. The order was dated Dublin, April 17, 1799. A similar order was issued by Major-General Cockburn to the 11th Infantry at Chelmsford, Essex, in 1810. Plowden, *ibid.*, 124, 126. See chap. xv., *infra*.

[51] Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 343.

[52] Plowden, *ibid.*, pp. 103-104. Cf. pp. 120, 124, *notes*. Two men, John Flemming and Francis Gough, after having been inhumanly flogged in Beresford's yeomanry riding-school, to extort confessions, were sent adrift through the streets, naked and streaming with blood, and with melted pitch and feathers on their heads. "Gough's flagellation was superintended by Lord Kingsborough, who, almost at every lash, questioned him how he liked it; it was so severe as to have confined him [Gough] six months to his bed." These facts were related to Plowden "by the spectator and the sufferer." Lord Kingsborough was captured by the insurgents in Wexford, and was treated by them with great consideration. Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxv., p. 297; Lecky, iv., 450, 456, 459, 460, *sqq*.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

great extent filled the ranks of the North Cork militia regiment with men after his own heart, before they were drafted to Wexford to take a hand in the work of torturing the people into armed resistance.[53]

Three contemporary historians, who lived on the spot—one a Protestant, and the others Catholics—agree in stating that the Orange system was first *publicly* and openly introduced into Wexford county by this regiment, shortly before the insurrection. Hay, in his *History of the Insurrection*, tells how there were found in the Wexford military barracks occupied by the North Corks, a pitch-cap "and an Orange commission or warrant, appointing a sergeant of the North Cork militia to found an Orange lodge in the town."[54] He states that the regiment in question contained "a great number of Orangemen," who made a public display of their ribbons, devices, etc.[55] Myles Byrne,[56] who lived inside Wexford county,

[53] *Two years* before the insurrection, according to an authority quoted by Lecky, one-third of the North Cork militia was composed of Protestants. This proportion was probably very largely increased by Lord Kingsborough and his fellow-officers. Lecky acts as the apologist of the North Cork militia. He is prepared to admit that the officers of the regiment were Orangemen (iv., 351). He, however, hazards the extraordinary statement that a regiment recruited in the Catholic county of Cork *could not possibly* "have consisted *largely* of Orangemen" (*ibid*). But (*a*) Lecky advances nothing in support of this statement, which is moreover contradicted by the positive evidence of contemporary historians and eye-witnesses. (*b*) The detachment of the North Cork regiment stationed in Wexford, numbered at most 600 men (Lecky, iv., 354-355); (*c*) far greater numbers of avowed Orangemen subsequently joined the yeomanry in the "essentially Catholic" and much smaller county of Wexford. (*d*) The character, conduct, and anti-Catholic associations of Lord Kingsborough (which Lecky apparently does not take into account) make it very probable that he would endeavour to exclude members of the hated creed from his regiment, and fill its ranks, as far as possible, with men of a strongly anti-Catholic stamp, or who, when once under his command, could be made so, or compelled to act as such. (*e*) The behaviour of the North Cork militia among the Catholic population of Wexford is in singular accord with that of the Tyrone and other Orange regiments elsewhere, and contrasts forcibly with what Lecky terms "the excellent conduct" of the King's county militia in the adjoining county of Carlow (Lecky, iv., 275). I can find no instance in which a Catholic militia regiment systematically tortured and outraged their co-religionists, before the insurrection, as the North Corks did. (*f*) What Lecky terms the "alliance" between the Government and the Orange society gave a great impetus to the spread of Orangeism among all classes. A large body of the Irish militia-men were undoubtedly Catholics, but of many of the Ulster regiments, at least, Plowden's statement was true, that at a later date (1810) "a large portion [of them] were Orangemen." *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 124. Cf. *note* 33, *supra*.

[54] P. 175.

[55] P. 57.

[56] After the insurrection he entered the French army, "served with

and took an active part in the insurrection, says in his *Memoirs* that the North Corks were "distinguished for making Orangemen, hanging, picketing, putting on pitch-caps, etc." Taylor, the Protestant writer referred to above, admits that there were Orangemen in the towns where the North Cork militia was stationed.[57] "This corps," says Plowden, another contemporary, "superabounded in Orangemen, who were encouraged by their colonel [Lord Kingsborough] in displaying the triumphant insignia of their institution, such as medals and Orange ribands at their breasts, and in proselytising for their order."[58] On their arrival in Wexford, the North Corks promptly set about the task of provoking a rebellion. With the willing help of the kindred spirits of the yeomanry, with whom they were quartered, they quickly turned a peaceable and prosperous county into a pandemonium, filled with the smoke of burning homes and the shrieks of victims undergoing, untried, the agonies of slow torture.

THE BREAKING OF THE STORM.

One must view the proceedings of the Orange soldiery in 1798 in the light of the lodge outrages of 1795, 1796, and 1797. The proceedings which immediately led to the insurrection were but the crowning achievement of the war of proscription which had been waging during the three previous years. It needs but a slight acquaintance with the seamy side of human nature to gauge what would happen when martial law was proclaimed, on the 30th March, 1798; when the safeguards of personal right were abolished; when a hostile magistracy were protected by special Acts of Parliament from the consequences of illegalities and outrages perpetrated, or to be perpetrated, by them on a people from whom they differed in religion, in politics, and frequently in race; when an undisciplined Orange soldiery, recruited mainly from the lowest classes of the population, were let loose, at free quarters, among a people whom they regarded with feelings of deadly hatred, for the purpose of forcing them into insurrection by harsh treatment.

It is but natural to expect that, in the circumstances, conscience would be drugged, the "qualifications of an Orange-

distinction in Spain, the Low Countries, and Germany," and became Chef-de-Bataillon and officer of the Legion of Honour. Webb's *Irish Biography*, p. 65. Mitchel sets a very high value on Byrne's *Memoirs*.

[57] *The Rebellion in the County of Wexford*, p. 15. Cf. this chapter, *supra*. It is significant that the yeomanry in the towns referred to—Wexford, Enniscorthy, Ferns, and Gorey—vied with the militia in the infliction of torture, etc., upon the people before the rising.

[58] *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 100-101; Hay, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, ed. 1803, p. 57.

man" embalmed, and that the sole guide of personal conduct would be the passion of the hour. The proclamation of martial law and free-quarters, says Lecky, "was undoubtedly a proximate cause of the rebellion."[59] "Free-quarters," says Sir Jonah Barrington, "rendered officers and soldiers despotic masters of the peasantry, their houses, food, property, and, occasionally, their *families*. This measure was resorted to, with all its attendant horrors, throughout some of the best parts of Ireland, previous to the insurrection, and for the purpose of exciting it."[60] "Martial law," says Lecky, "is always an extreme remedy of the State. . . . But few things are more terrible than martial law when the troops are undisciplined, inadequate in numbers, and involved in the factions of the country they are intended to subdue."[61] I have already shown that the Irish yeomanry forces were composed mainly of Orangemen. They were recruited principally from the lower and more ignorant strata of the community. "It [the yeomanry] was," says Lecky, "recruited chiefly in districts which had been for years the scene of savage faction fights between the Defenders and the Peep-o'-Day Boys, between the United Irishmen and the Orangemen."[62] The same writer adds: "In great districts which were torn by furious factions, it consisted exclusively of the partisans of one faction, recruited under circumstances well fitted to raise party animosity to fever heat. Such men, with uniforms on their backs and guns in their hands, and clothed with the authority of the Government, but with scarce a tinge of discipline, and under no strict martial law, were now let loose by night on innumerable cabins."[63] Elsewhere in the same volume Lecky states that the yeomanry forces were "demoralised by a long course of license."[64] Such a force, he says again, was "perfectly sure to be guilty of gross violence."[65] While claiming that the employment of armed fanatics was successful as a piece of military strategy, he remarks: "The Irish yeomanry have been much *and justly* blamed by historians for their want of discipline, for their extreme recklessness in destroying both life and property, and for the violent religious passions they too frequently displayed."[66] One looks in vain among the records of this woful period for any action of the Orange

[59] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 265.
[60] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, 2nd ed., p. 351, *note*.
[61] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 39.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 268.
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 341. Cf. Killen, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 369, *note*.

soldiery, the whole and sole guiding motive of which was clearly a loyal adherence to the laws or Constitution of their country. Their conduct before, during, and after the insurrection, was marked by the vindictive and promiscuous infliction of cruel punishments, which were outrages on personal right, which were criminal in their kind or in the method of their infliction, and which were directed against the innocent as well as the guilty. These outrages were committed either from sheer wantonness, or under the pretence of extorting confessions, or of searching for arms in districts that were, or were supposed to be, disaffected. The outrages referred to may be grouped under the following heads:

I. *Outrages directed against property:* (1) Plunder; (2) the burning of houses, and other forms of destruction of property.

II. *Outrages against the person:* (1) Outrages on women; (2) the systematic infliction of slow torture; (3) murder or massacre.

SMOKE AND FLAME IN ULSTER.

I. These varied forms of illegality and outrage began soon after the formation of the Orange yeomanry in Ulster. They were reduced to a system while the country lay helpless and writhing under martial law. They reached their greatest height during and shortly after the insurrection of 1798. In Ulster, military excesses were perpetrated on the people in the spring and summer of 1797, over a year before the outbreak of the rebellion. On the 17th and 19th March of that year, General Lake wrote to Pelham that the yeomanry "are under little control, either officers or men;" and that such excesses as had occurred in that province may have been committed "chiefly by the yeomanry," for the purpose of "gratifying their party spirit and private quarrels."[67] An Orange eye-witness, Captain Giffard of the Dublin militia, in a confidential letter to the Government, describes the proceedings of the Ancient Britons and the Orange yeomanry in Ulster, after they had made numerous unsuccessful expeditions among the people under the pretence of searching for concealed arms. The reader has already seen that the Ancient Britons were "mostly Orangemen." The Britons, Giffard wrote, "burned a great number of houses, and *the object of emulation between them and the Orange yeomen* seems to be, who shall do the most mischief to wretches who certainly may have seditious minds, but who are at present quiet and incapable of resistance." In the course of this letter Captain Giffard describes the historic and unprovoked massacre of

[67] Quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 40

Ballyholan. "I was directed" [to the Ancient Britons] said he, "by the smoke and flames of burning houses, and by the dead bodies of boys and old men, slain by the Britons, though *no opposition whatever* had been given to them; and, as I shall answer to Almighty God, I believe a single gun was not fired but *by the Britons or yeomanry*. I declare there was nothing to fire at, *old men, women, and children excepted*. From ten to twenty were killed outright; many wounded, and eight houses burned." Sixteen prisoners were taken. "The next day," continues Captain Giffard, "they were all proved perfectly innocent . . . But the worst of the story still remains; two of the Britons desiring to enter a gentleman's house, the yard gate was opened to them by a lad, whom, for his civility, they shot and cut in pieces."[68] This atrocious massacre, says Plowden, "has always been considered to have mainly contributed to the rebellion, which took place in the next year."[69]

Giffard's letter, says Lecky, "throws a ghastly light on the condition of Ulster, and the levity with which those things appear to have been regarded is even more horribly significant. There are frequent allusions to the multitude of prisoners who thronged the gaols, and many of them were sent, without trial, to the fleet."[70] Lord Dunsany, in the Irish House of Lords,

[68] Quoted by Lecky, *ibid.*, pp. 41-42. Cf. Plowden, *Historical Review*, vol. ii., p. 626-627, and *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 92-96. Plowden says, "it happened, however, on this, as on many such occasions, that the searchers made free with articles of dress or furniture, as their fancies suggested." Among the murdered were a woman and an old man of seventy. A woman "far gone with child" was fired at, and two boys were shot, one of ten years old, the other of six. The murder of the latter by two Ancient Britons, is thus described by Plowden in his *Ireland from its Union:* "Near the gate stood a boy named Ryan, about six years of age, whom they ordered to open it: the child said he would, if they would not hurt him. Before he could open it, one of them struck at the child with his sabre over the gate, and broke his arm. They still insisted upon his opening it, which the child did with his other hand, and they rode through and cut up the boy with their sabres, and one of them made his horse (though with much difficulty) trample upon him." They then entered the cellar of the house and gave Orange toasts. The Orange yeomanry who took a leading share in this day's work, were those of Newry.

The Captain Giffard mentioned above is described by Plowden as "the great apostle of Orangeism." *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 91; cf. Madden's *United Irishmen*, ii., 291-296. An account of the Ballyholan massacre is also given by "Observer," quoted in Madden's *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., Appendix 6, p. 336.

[69] Plowden, *op. cit.*, p. 92, *note*. This writer adds (p. 96. *note*) that the Britons afterwards "never came into contact with the rebels without being reminded of *Ballyholan*, and they were generally refused quarter . . . They exceeded one thousand effective men, and it is generally computed that not nearly one-tenth of the privates, who first came over, survived the contest."

[70] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 42-43. Particulars of

told a grim tale of house-burnings and cold-blooded murders by the military, of transportations without trial, etc.[71] Dr. Browne, of the Dublin University, offered, in the Irish House of Commons, to give proof of "numerous instances" of the same classes of outrages having been committed by the military *and yeomanry*.[72] A meeting of Dublin city freeholders, held in July, 1797, declared by resolution that great numbers of persons "have had their houses burned, or been themselves transported or put to death, without even the form of accusation or trial."[73] The Protestant statesman, Grattan, refers at the same time to "barbarities committed on the habitations, property, and persons of the people."[74] Lord Moira, an Ulster Protestant landlord, told a similar tale of capricious house-burning, torture, and wanton destruction of property in one of the most peaceable portions of his province, before the insurrection.[75] "We have," continues Lecky, "abundant evidence that great numbers of poor men's houses were, at this time [in Ulster before the insurrection] burnt on slight reasons and without a shadow of legal justification; and there is much reason to believe that in the midnight raids many persons were shot by soldiers, *or more probably by yeomen*, in a manner that differed little, if at all, from simple murder. All these things naturally tended to stir up fierce and enduring animosities."[76]

LEINSTER GETS ITS INNINGS.

"The burnings of houses," says Lecky, "which had been well known in the North, was now carried on upon a yet larger scale in Leinster, and the free quarters formed a new and

---

cases of this kind are given by Plowden in his *Hist. Review*, vol. ii., pp. 623-624.

[71] Quoted by Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 46, *note*.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[74] Grattan's *Life and Times*, by his son, vol. iv., p. 301.

[75] Morrison Davidson, *The Book of Erin*, p. 200. Godkin, *The Land War in Ireland*, p. 267.

[76] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 44, 45-46. Lord Carhampton, who was commander-in-chief in Ireland, originated the system of summarily transporting people without any or proper trial. He came to Ireland as Colonel Luttrell, to mend a broken fortune, and joined the powerful Beresford party in their policy of coercion. Free-quarters, picketing, pitch-capping, half-hanging, etc., were introduced under his *régime*. Junius said of him: "He has discovered a new line in human character; he has disgraced even the name of Luttrell." According to Bowles Daly, "Luttrell was regarded with such awe and hatred by the peasantry, that many supposed he was possessed with the devil, and he was known by the name of 'Satanides,' owing to the cold-blooded atrocities which he committed." *Ireland in Ninety-eight*, pp. 64-65.

terrible feature in the system of military coercion."[77] "The houses of the [Leinster] peasantry were burning in all directions," says Walpole.[78] Many houses were burned down simply because their owners were absent, and villages were deserted by the terror-stricken inhabitants.[79] All this took place before the outbreak of the rebellion of 1798. The counties of Wexford, Wicklow, Carlow, and Kildare were the portions of Leinster which suffered most from the unrestrained brutality of the soldiery. The wholesale destruction of the homes of the people was authorised by no civil law; it was justified by no plea of military necessity; it was carried out under the pretence of searching for concealed arms, or from sheer caprice, or sectarian hate, or private malice. The yeomanry, etc., frequently burned houses, the owners of which had fled in great numbers in terror of the murders and torturings which, as we shall see, were the ordinary accompaniments of the military raids.[80] Wexford, one of the most prosperous, contented and peaceable counties in Ireland,[81] was made to bear the chief brunt of military lawlessness. The North Cork militia *and the yeomanry corps, who were stationed in the same towns*, joined hand in hand in the gruesome work of goading the people to insurrection. The most infamous of the Wexford yeomanry were known as the Black Mob. Myles Byrne, in his *Memoirs*, says that this corps was composed of "low Orangemen." Hay, another contemporary and local writer, says, in a passage of his *History* already quoted, that they publicly wore all the devices of Orangemen.[82] They were organised and led by the notorious Hunter Gowan, "who," says Lecky, "now became famous for the multitude of houses he burnt."[83] The Black Mob were stationed at Gorey, where a detachment of the North Cork militia was also quartered on the people.[84] Referring to the criminal destruction of the homes of the people in Leinster, the Protestant historian, Lecky, says: "Horrible abuses and horrible sufferings inevitably accompanied these things. Many who resisted, and not a few it is said who did not resist, were shot dead on their

---

[77] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 268.

[78] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xviii., p. 478; cf. Lecky, iv., 269.

[79] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 46, *note*, 349, 296; cf. Walpole, xvii., 467 (for Ulster).

[80] Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 343-344. Walpole's *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xx., p. 488.

[82] *Hist. of the Insurrection*, ed. 1803, p. 57.

[83] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 276. Cf. Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxiv., p. 284; Hay's *Hist. of the Insurrection*, pp. 69-71, ed. 1803.

[84] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxiv., p. 284; Musgrave, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, p. 326; Hay, p. 71.

thresholds, while countless families were deprived of all they possessed, and were driven homeless into the world. Farm horses were seized and carried away. Stores of provisions were broken into and shamefully wasted or destroyed, and acts of simple robbery and pure wanton violence were of daily occurrence."[85] Mrs. Leadbeater, a Quaker authoress, who resided at the time in Carlow county, contrasts the excellent conduct of the King's County militia, who were quartered upon the people in her district, with that of the Tyrone militia who succeeded them. The latter made an ostentatious display of Orange ribbons, and indiscriminately plundered both the loyal and the disloyal.[86] Lecky testifies to the terror which the yeomanry of Leinster, generally, inspired in the people during the agonising weeks which preceded the rising of 1798.[87] "Orange yeomanry," says another Protestant writer, " . . . as full of cruel fanaticism as destitute of the very elements of military discipline, revelled in every conceivable form of rapine and outrage."[88] What the Protestant historian, Walpole, had said of the close of 1797 was still more true of this short period of concentrated woe. The yeomanry forces, which, said Walpole, were "composed almost entirely of Orangemen," were, with the Ancient Britons and others, "encouraged to play havoc with the miserable inhabitants of the proclaimed districts. . . . Houses were plundered and burnt, women outraged, and children brutally ill-treated and murdered. Men were seized and sent on board tenders, untried. They were flogged, 'picketed,' and half-hung, to extort confessions as to concealed arms. They were hunted down and sabred. Villages and whole districts were devastated, and the inhabitants turned out of their homes into the ditch."[89] The reader is once more requested to bear in mind that the writers quoted above are describing the conduct of the Orange soldiery *in the days of peace.*

"THE GALLANT ORANGE YEOMANRY."

II.—(1) Respect for, and chivalrous defence of, female honour was so characteristic of Christian soldiery at their best period that the word "gallantry," in its best sense, has come to be synonymous of personal bravery and of courtly respect for women. There is, perhaps, no other form of military barbarity which arouses such deep and lasting feelings of

[85] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 271.
[86] *Leadbeater Papers*, vol. i., pp. 223, 224, quoted by Lecky, iv., 275. See *note* 38, *supra*.
[87] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 276.
[88] Morrison Davidson, *The Book of Erin*, p. 200.
[89] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xvii., p. 467.

revenge, and which leads to such fierce reprisals, as outrages on defenceless females. The "qualifications" of the Orange body would naturally lead us to expect that their soldiery would be beau-ideals of Christian chivalry—modern counterparts of the fearless and reproachless knights whose highest glory, next to fighting the battles of the faith, was to shield the defenceless; and who saw in every good woman the image of the spotless Virgin-Mother, whom the Protestant laureate Wordsworth styled "our tainted nature's solitary boast." Nevertheless, search as you will the annals of lodge history from Dan to Beersheba, you will find them barren of any display of conspicuous respect for women on the part of the Orange military forces. On the contrary, military history furnishes few, if any, worse examples of cool, calculated, coarse brutality towards the female sex, than were displayed *in the days of peace* towards their own country-women, by the Irish Orange soldiery in 1797 and the two following years. One pretext for outrages of this kind arose from the then recently developed hatred of Orangemen for green, which has long been officially recognised as the national colour of Ireland.[90] This antipathy arose, as we have seen, among the Orange yeomanry of Ulster. It rapidly extended to their *confrères*, the Ancient Britons, and the Orange yeomanry of Leinster. It was then the custom of many women of every creed, class, and shade of politics in South and North to wear, quite innocently, articles of apparel bearing sundry shades of the forbidden hue.[91] Referring to a period *preceding* the insurrection, Lecky says:

"Outrages on women were very common. Peasant girls had often thrown themselves enthusiastically into the United Irish movement, and attested their sentiments by their green ribbons, while many others who knew or cared nothing about politics wore something green in their dress. Every person who did so was tolerably sure to be exposed to insults which planted far and wide, among a peasantry peculiarly susceptible on such matters, the seeds of deadly, enduring hatred."[92] The Ancient Britons and the low class of yeomanry organised in Wicklow, were ferocious scourges of the people.[93] These military ruffians cut the petticoats off women with their sabres. The offending garments contained a tinge of green, "a colour certainly with them [the wearers] innocent of disaffection," as

[90] See chap. xi., *supra*, p. 216, *note*.

[91] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i,, chap. xxxiii., pp. 271-272.

[92] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 273.

[93] See General Sir John Moore's opinion of the Wicklow yeomanry, quoted above, *note*. For the Ancient Britons, see Lecky, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 343.

a local Protestant magistrate declared.[94] Wexford county was held by 600 North Corks and a large body of yeomanry. They also, in the days of peace, tore petticoats, handkerchiefs, ribbons, and caps off women of even "enthusiastic loyalty."[95]

The same thing was done in Ulster by the Tyrone Orange yeomanry, and by the Ancient Britons, as early as 1797. In the case of the latter, the outrage was, on at least one occasion, accompanied with circumstances of scandalous indecency.[96] In the same year (1797) the Protestant bishop of Down, Dr. Dickson, assured Lord Holland that "he had seen families returning peaceably from Mass assailed without provocation by drunken troops and yeomanry, and the wives and daughters exposed to every species of indignity, brutality, and outrage, from which neither his remonstrances nor those of other Protestant gentlemen could rescue them."[97] It was stated at the same time that, during this period, women were dragged from their beds in Ulster, to see their houses burned—presumably by the Orange soldiery, who were then indulging freely in this latter form of amusement. Walpole, in a passage already quoted, mentions barbarities committed on women as one of the forms of systematic cruelty practiced by the Orange yeomanry and the Ancient Britons. The Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, in a sentence of his correspondence which singles out the atrocities of the yeomanry for special reprobation, stated that, on his arrival in 1798, free-quarters "comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole conntry."[98] During the insurrection, says Mitchel, "the treatment of women by these Hessians and the yeomanry cowards was truly horrible; and the less capable of any excuse, as, in this matter at least, there could be no pretence for retaliation."[99] The contemporary writer, Plowden, says, in his *Review of the State of Ireland*: "It has been boasted of by officers of rank that, within certain large districts, a woman had not been left undefiled; and upon observation, in answer, that the sex must then have been complying, the reply was, that the bayonet removed all squeamishness." The leading share in these, as in every other form of atrocity, was taken by the Hessian dragoons

[94] Quoted by Lecky, *ibid.*, p. 274, *note*.

[95] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i,, chap. xxxiv., p. 284; Gordon's *History of the Rebellion*, p. 59.

[96] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 99.

[97] Lord Holland, *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, Longman's ed. of 1852, vol. i., p. 114. See also Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

[98] Letter to Major-General Ross, April 13, 1799. Compare extract from Barrington, given over *note* 60, *supra*.

[99] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxv., p. 300; cf. Major-General Napier's words, quoted by Mitchel, vol. i.,chap. xxxiii., p. 272.

and the Orange soldiery. Among a people who so highly prized the priceless jewel of female honour, these outrages, says Plowden, "produced an indignant horror in the country, which went beyond, but prevented retaliation." Lecky, while condemning the excesses of the insurgents, says that "it is acknowledged on all sides that they abstained to a most remarkable degree from outrages on women, while on the other side this usual incident of military license was terribly frequent."[100] A similar verdict is given by Bouverie-Pusey, another Protestant historian.[101] Rev. James Gordon, who lived in Wexford during the insurrection, says: "In one point I think we must allow some praise to the rebels: amid all their atrocities, the chastity of women was respected. I have not been able to ascertain one instance to the contrary in the county of Wexford, though many beautiful young women were absolutely in the power of the rebels."[102] Even the Orange writer, Musgrave, admits that "on most occasions [the insurgents] did not offer any violence to the tender sex."[103] Sir Jonah Barrington, who was then an Orangeman, says: "It is a singular fact that, in all the ferocity of the conflict, the storming of towns and of villages, women were uniformly respected by the insurgents. Though numerous ladies fell occasionally into their power, they never experienced any incivility or misconduct."[104] The military outrages on women went far to arouse in the breasts of the insurgents a hatred of Orangeism, and that spirit of revenge which found expression in the fierce, but unauthorised, reprisals of Wexford Bridge, Vinegar Hill, and Scullabogue Barn.

THE ORANGE INQUISITION.

(2) One of Queen Elizabeth's deputies for Munster received

[100] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 471; cf. p. 366. The same author records how, while Wexford town was in the hands of the insurgents, Protestant women were not imprisoned or otherwise molested; that they there were treated "with great respect," and that sentinels were placed at the houses of several Protestant ladies, "to protect them from insult" (p. 450).

[101] "The rebels seldom or never outraged women, whilst the Royalists often did." *The Past History of Ireland*, p. 110.

[102] *Hist. of the Rebellion*, p. 213. Gordon says in his *History* (p. 217): "Women and children were not put to death by the insurgents, except in the tumultuous and hasty massacre of Scullabogue." See Walpole's statement *infra*, regarding the murder of women and children by the Orange yeomanry and the Ancient Britons in the time of peace.

[103] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, p. 428.

[104] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, 2nd ed., p. 362, *note*. Barrington (*ibid.*) tells how one of Hompesch's German soldiers shot a Mrs. Stringer, the wife of a Royalist attorney, at Enniscorthy. The insurgents subsequently took some of those Germans prisoners, and piked them all, as they told them, "just to teach them how to shoot ladies."

orders to torture her suspected Irish subjects whenever he should "find it convenient." These instructions were in accordance with the principles of judicial procedure then in vogue. But the systematic use of torture as a means of extracting evidence had disappeared in Great Britain and Ireland before the rise of the Orange association. It was reserved for the members of that society to illegally revive it in the British dominions; to carry it out on a vast scale, and with circumstances of barbarity to which it would be, perhaps, impossible to find a parallel in the authentic proceedings of the worst days of the much-abused Spanish Inquisition. The barbarity of the practice was aggravated by the following further circumstances of hardship:

(*a*) The use of torture by the Orange soldiery (and magistracy) was not the unauthorised act of irresponsible individuals. It was part of a settled policy. In due course we shall see that it was stoutly advocated and defended in press and Parliament, and practised under the eye of the Government, by the standard-bearers of the Orange association.

(*b*) The practice was illegal. This circumstance might fairly be expected to have counted with men whose avowed purpose was to maintain and defend the laws of their country. "What," exclaims Lecky, "could be more hideously repugnant both to the letter and the spirit and the practice of English law than this systematic employment of torture as a means of extorting confessions?"

(*c*) The use of torture was begun, and long carried out, in the days of peace. Its worst excesses were committed in two of the most peaceable and prosperous counties of Ireland, Wexford and Wicklow, upon a population which took "very little interest in political questions."[105]

(*d*) Many innocent men, says Lecky, were "tortured on the vaguest and most unfounded suspicion," and many others for the gratification of private vengeance. The formality of a trial was usually dispensed with.[106]

(*e*) As Lord Bedford declared in the English House of Lords, these "cruelties had not been resorted to on the spur of the moment, but *had been deliberately resolved upon long before for a certain purpose*."[107] That purpose was, as we have seen, to

---

[105] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p, 342; cf. pp. 343, 344.

[106] *Ibid.*, pp. 272, 273, 284; Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xviii., p. 478; Mitchel, vol. i., chaps. xxxiii. to xxxv.

[107] Quoted by Godkin (a Protestant writer) in *The Battle-fields of Ninety-eight (National Review*, 1868); compare the same writer's *Land War in Ireland*, pp. 267-268.

goad the people into an unsuccessful rebellion, and thus "smooth the way for the Union."

Writing of the period that immediately preceded the rising of 1798, the Protestant historian, Mitchel, says: "It is notorious that the Orange yeomanry serving in Leinster were amongst the most furious and savage torturers of the people."[108] The Protestant Unionist writer, Mr. Goldwin Smith, formerly Regius Professor of History at Oxford University, thus refers to the same period in his *Irish History and Irish Character*:

"The Protestant gentry and yeomanry, as one man, became Cromwellians again. Then commenced a reign of terror scarcely less savage than that of the Jacobins. The suspected conspirators were intimidated, and confessions, or pretended confessions, were extorted, by loosing upon the homes of the peasantry the license and barbarity of an irregular soldiery, more cruel than a regular invader. Flogging, half-hanging, pitch-capping, picketing, went on over a large district, and the most barbarous scourgings, without trial, were inflicted in the Riding-house, Dublin, in the very seat of government and justice. This was styled 'exerting a vigour beyond the law,' and to become the object of such vigour it was enough, as under Robespierre, to be suspected of being a suspect." A few pages further on, the same author writes: "The peasantry, though undoubtedly in a disturbed state, might have been kept quiet by lenity; but they were gratuitously scourged and tortured into open rebellion. . . . These were the crimes, not of individual ruffians, but of a faction—a faction which must take its place in history beside that of Robespierre, Couthon, and Carrier. The murders committed by the Jacobins were more numerous, and may have excited more indignation and pity, because the victims were of higher rank; but *in the use of torture the Orangemen seem to have reached a pitch of fiendish cruelty which was scarcely attained by the Jacobins.*"[109]

The following were the chief of the many modes of torture to which the defenceless people were subjected during the second Orange Reign of Terror:

(*a*) Picketing;
(*b*) Half-hanging;
(*c*) The pitched cap;
(*d*) Scourging.

[108] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxii., p. 269.

[109] *Irish History and Irish Character*, 2nd ed., pp. 169, 174 (Parker, Oxford and London, 1862). I find the following words quoted from the same work, presumably from the first or other edition which I have not been able to consult: "The dreadful civil war of 1798 was the crime—as a candid study of its history will prove—not of the Irish people, but of the Orange terrorists, who literally goaded the people into insurrection."

These forms of torture are so constantly referred to by both Protestant and Catholic writers in their accounts of the proceedings which led to the insurrection of 1798, that a few details regarding them may not be out of place.

POINTED STAKE AND SLIP KNOT.

(*a*) *Picketing and* (*b*) *half-hanging.* The torture of picketing, as practised in the army in 1745, is thus described by a writer in *Chambers' Journal* of October 19, 1895: "In picketing, the culprit's naked heel rested on a sharpened stake [termed a "picket"] driven into the ground, his right wrist and right leg being drawn up as high as they could be to a hook fixed in an adjoining post. The whole weight of the body rested on the sharpened stake, which, though it did not break the skin, inflicted exquisite torture; the only means of alleviation was to rest the weight on the wrist, the pain of which soon became unendurable."[110] Half-hanging was carried out as follows: the suspect or other victim was, usually without any form of trial (as in the case of picketing), hanged by the neck till he was half-dead, cut down again, allowed to come to his senses, and then strung up again and yet again, until he died under the torture, or made a real or pretended confession regarding concealed arms, etc. This punishment brought the agonies of death by slow strangulation, without that release from further bodily suffering which accompanies death[111]

"Torture," says Lecky, "was at the same time [before the insurrection] systematically employed to discover arms. *Great multitudes* were flogged till they almost fainted; picketed

---

[110] A similar description of this torture is given by Morrison Davidson in *The Book of Erin*, p. 200.

[111] "Lieutenant Hepenstall," says Bowles Daly, "presents a remarkable instance of the brutality of the day." He was an ex-apothecary, a giant in stature, a Sampson in brute strength. When he encountered a peasant whose answers did not satisfy his somewhat capricious requirements, he felled him with a blow of his fist, and (in his own words) "used some threats, and pricked him with a bayonet to induce him to confess." Hepenstall then, "adjusting the noose round the prisoner's neck, drew the rope over his own shoulders, and trotted about, the victim's legs dangling in the air until death at last put an end to the torture." These details were sworn to by several witnesses, and admitted by Hepenstall himself at the trial of one Hyland, which took place at Athy, under the Whiteboys Act, in 1797. Hepenstall (or Hempenstall, as Madden calls him) was known as "The Walking Gallows." An epitaph written for him runs as follows:

"Here lie the bones of Hepenstall,
Judge, jury, gallows, rope and all."

Bowles Daly, *Ireland in Ninety-eight*, pp. 66-67. A similar account of Hepenstall is given by Madden and Barrington, and by Lecky in his *England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. viii., p. 22.

and half-strangled to extort confessions."[112] In a passage already quoted, Sir Jonah Barrington says: "Slow torture was inflicted *under the pretence* of extracting confessions: the people were goaded and driven to madness."[113] Rev. James Gordon, [114] Walpole,[115] Goldwin Smith, Morrison Davidson, Godkin, and other Protestant historians write in a similar strain of the same period. In November, 1797—the year before the insurrection—Lord Moira, an Ulster Protestant landlord, said in the English House of Lords: "When a man was taken upon suspicion he was put to the torture; nay, if he was merely accused of concealing the guilt of another. The rack, indeed, was not at hand, but the punishment of picketing was in practice, which had been for some years abolished as too inhuman, even in the dragoon service. He [Lord Moira] had known a man, in order to extort confession, of a supposed crime, or of that of some of his neighbours, picketed till he actually fainted, picketed a second time till he fainted again, and, as soon as he came to himself, picketed a third time, till he once more fainted, and all upon mere suspicion."[116] These things took place before the insurrection, and (said the noble Lord) "in a part of the country as quiet and free from disturbance as the city of London."

The distinguished contemporary statesman and philanthropist, Lord Holland, writes as follows in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party*:[117]

"The fact, however, is incontrovertible, that the people of Ireland were driven to resistance, which possibly they meditated before, by the free quarters and the excesses of the soldiery, which were such as are not permitted in civilized warfare, even in an enemy's country. Trials, if so they may be called, were carried on without number under martial law. It often happened that three officers composed the court, and that of the three, two were under age, and the third an officer of the yeomanry or militia, who had sworn in his Orange lodge eternal hatred to the people over whom he was thus constituted as judge. Floggings, picketings, death, were the usual sentences, and these were sometimes commuted into banishment, serving in the fleet, or transference to a foreign service. Many were sold at so much per head to the Prussians."

---

[112] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 271.
[113] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, 2nd ed., p. 351.
[114] *Hist of the Rebellion*, pp. 65-76.
[115] *Kingdom of Ireland*, ch. xix., p. 478.
[116] Quoted by Godkin, *The Battlefields of Ninety-eight* (*National Review*, 1868); see also his *Land War in Ireland*, p. 267.
[117] Vol. i., pp. 113-114.

Hay, the local and contemporary historian of the Wexford insurrection, referring to the tortures inflicted on the people by the yeomanry before the outbreak, says: "Many unfortunate men, who were taken in their houses, were strung up, as it were to be hanged, but were let down now and then to try if strangulation would oblige them to become informers. After these and the like experiments [scourging, etc., included], several persons languished for some time, and at length perished in consequence of them."[118] According to the *Memoirs* of Myles Byrne, the Enniscorthy yeomanry "never marched out of the town without being accompanied by a regular executioner with his ropes, cat-o'-nine-tails, etc.," for the purpose, says Lecky, of "flogging and half-strangling suspected persons."[119]

THE PITCHED CAP.

(*c*) The pitched cap was invented, or at least introduced into Wexford county, by the North Cork militia, a large body of whom were, as we have seen, Orangemen. According to Hay and Lecky, this species of torture was principally intended for persons who wore their hair "cropped" short, and who were for that reason supposed to be in sympathy with the United Irish movement. "The torture of these men," says Lecky, "soon became *a popular amusement* among the soldiers."[120] When a "croppy" was seen, or pointed out by a "loyal" neighbour, he was, says Hay, "immediately seized and [without the formality of a trial] brought into a guard-house, where caps, either of coarse linen or strong brown paper, besmeared inside with pitch, were always kept ready for service. The unfortunate victim had one of these, well heated, compressed on his head, and when judged of a proper degree of coolness, so that it could not be easily pulled off, the sufferer was turned out amidst the horrid acclamations of the merciless torturers, and to the view of vast numbers of the people who generally crowded about the guard-house door, attracted by the cries of the tormented. Many of those persecuted in this manner experienced additional anguish from the melted pitch trickling into their eyes. This afforded a rare addition of enjoyment to these keen sportsmen, who reiterated their horrid yells of exultation on the repetition of the several accidents to which their game was liable from being turned out; for, in the confusion and hurry of escaping from the ferocious hands of

[118] *Hist. of the Insurrection*, p. 64. Hay, (pp. 64-66) gives some harrowing instances of the inflicting of this form of torture.

[119] Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (vol. iv., p. 349, cf. p. 348); Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxii., p. 266; Hay, *Hist. of the Insurrection*, p. 71.

[120] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 272.

these more than savage barbarians, the blinded victims frequently fell, or inadvertently dashed their heads against the walls in their way. The pain of disengaging this pitched cap from the head must be next to intolerable. The hair was often torn out by the roots, and not unfrequently parts of the skin were so scalded or blistered as to adhere and come off along with it. The terror and dismay that these outrages occasioned is inconceivable. A sergeant of the North Cork, nicknamed *Tom the Devil*, was most ingenious in devising new methods of torture. Moistened gunpowder was frequently rubbed into the hair, cut close, and then set on fire. Some, while shearing for this purpose, had the tips of their ears snipped off. Sometimes an entire ear, and often both ears, were completely cut off; and many lost their noses during the like preparation. But, strange to tell, these atrocities were publicly practised without the least reserve in open day, and no magistrate or officer ever interfered, but shamefully connived at this extraordinary mode of quieting the people."[121]

Lecky tells of "a man in Dublin who, maddened by the pain of the pitched cap, sprang into the Liffey, and ended at once his sufferings and his life."[122] The incident most probably took place in what the same writer describes as "the chief scene" of the worst forms of torture of this woful period—the yeomanry Riding-house, which was kept close to the bank of the Liffey by the notorious John Claudius Beresford, Grand Secretary of the Orange society.[123] "The torture of the pitched cap," says Lecky, "which never before appears to have been known in Ireland . . . excited fierce terror and resentment."[124] An idea of the horrible frequency of this form of torture and of half-hanging before the insurrection may be gained by reference to standard works on this agonising period of Irish history.

THE CAT-O'-NINE TAILS.

(*d*) *Scourging* was another "popular amusement" in which the yeomanry forces took a leading share. Musgrave, the

[121] Hay, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, pp. 57-58. See also Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 272, 349; Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xx., p. 489. The torture of burning gunpowder was inflicted by "Tom the Devil" on a Protestant gentleman of property, Anthony Perry of Inch (Co. Wexford), who, says Walpole (*ibid.*) "is an instance of the way in which the people of Wexford were driven to exasperation." See also Hay, p. 76.

[122] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv. p. 276.

[123] Plowden, on the authority of one of the sufferers and of an eye-witness, records two particularly barbarous instances of flogging, pitch-capping and feathering, etc., perpetrated by Beresford and Lord Kingsborough. See *note* 52, *supra*.

[124] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 349.

Orange writer, in an Appendix to his *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, admits that this punishment, as inflicted, was obviously repugnant to both the letter and the spirit of the law. It was nevertheless inflicted by men who boasted of their loyalty. Floggings were, as Lecky states,[125] "very often" inflicted without any form of trial; for the gratification of private malice; on persons who were "perfectly innocent:"[126] frequently, with attendant circumstances of great barbarity; and before the outbreak of hostilities in 1798.

"No man was safe," says Walpole, referring to the south-eastern counties of Leinster at this period. "Shopkeeper and artisan equally had their backs cut to the bone; farmer and labourer were equally tortured on the pointed stake."[127] As indicating the severity with which this punishment was administered, Lecky (in a passage already quoted) tells how, through the province of Leinster, "great multitudes were flogged till they almost fainted," and how blacksmiths, on the suspicion of having made pikes, "were scourged almost to death in the streets of the villages" to compel them to confess.[128] "More than one victim," the same writer admits, "died under the lash."[129] Women are said to have been publicly flogged in the streets of Gorey, which was garrisoned by the yeomanry and the North Cork militia. Gordon, the Protestant historian, who lived near the spot, describes the terror which the floggings excited in the people in that neighbourhood, and records a case which he personally knew, of a working man who dropped dead through fear of this torture.[130] Hay, referring to the infliction of torture by the "yeomen and magistrates," previous to the outbreak, says: "Some, too, abandoned their houses for fear of being whipped . . . and this infliction many persons seemed to fear more than death itself." Reference has already been made to the habit adopted by the Enniscorthy yeomanry, of bringing with them, on their forays, an executioner with hanging ropes and cat-o'-nine-tails. In an outing to Ballaghkeene, this functionary plied the lash with such vigor that—to use the vigorous expression of an eye-witness—the spot of execution was covered with blood "as if a pig had been killed there."[131] The Riding-house, where the notorious Grand Secretary, John Claudius Beresford, exercised his Dublin yeomanry, "was" says Lecky,

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 273.
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 272.
[127] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xviii., p. 478.
[128] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 271.
[129] *Ibid.*, p. 275.
[130] *History of the Rebellion*, 1st ed., pp. 87-88.
[131] See Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* vol. iv., p. 350.

"well known as the chief scene of the torture."[132] Walpole says that the flogging was carried out "*under the direction* of John Claudius Beresford."[133] This and the other forms of torture were practised publicly in Dublin, under the very eyes of the Government of the day.[134] (The Dublin garrison, says Mitchel, consisted "chiefly of yeomanry.")[135] "In Beresford's Riding-house," says Mitchel,[136] "Sandys's Prévôt,[137] the Old Custom House,[138] the Royal Exchange,[139] some of the barracks, and other places in Dublin, there were daily, hourly, notorious exhibitions of these torturings, as there were in almost every town, village, and hamlet throughout the kingdom, in which troops were quartered." All this took place before the people rose in revolt.

In an Appendix to his *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland*, the Orange writer, Musgrave, stoutly defends the use made of the cat-o'-nine-tails before the rebellion. Alfred Webb, a learned Irish Protestant writer, thus refers to Musgrave: "He displayed such animosity against the Catholics, and outraged public decency so much by his defence of flogging and free quarters, that, according to a long notice in the *Annual Biography*, 'the Irish Government at length found it necessary to disown all connection with the author: and publicly disclaimed the idea of affording him either patronage or protection

[132] *Ibid.*, p. 276. In the English House of Commons, in March, 1801, Beresford said that "it was unmanly to deny torture, as it was notoriously practised." Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. i., p. 17. Gordon says that Dublin was noted for its scourging, etc., not alone of "the common people," but of "some even in circumstances far superior to that class." *Hist. of the Rebellion*, pp. 65, 76. A wag wrote the following inscription over the entrance to Beresford's Riding-House: "Mangling done here by J. Beresford and Co." Bowles Daly, *Ireland in Ninety-eight*, p. 63.

[133] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xxi., p. 501.

[134] Madden, who is perhaps, the greatest authority on this period, states that triangles were set up "*under the very windows of Lord Castlereagh's office*;" that people were flogged to death at them; and that torture was carried on "in the small vacant space adjoining the entrance to the Upper Castle Yard." Mitchel, vol. ii., chap. i., p. 17. See Walpole, chap. xxi., p. 501; Lecky, iv., 203, 293. Compare Barrington, *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, ed. 1844, p. 359.

[135] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. i., p. 15.

[136] *Ibid.*, vol. i., chap. xxxiii., p. 279. Mitchel is here fully borne out by Madden, and by Walpole (chap. xxi., p. 501).

[137] Major Sandys was, says Madden, "brother-in-law to Under Secretary Cooke, Lord Castlereagh's chief official in the Secretary's office." He was Brigade-Major to the Dublin garrison.

[138] The Old Custom House was the place where Beresford and Lord Kingsborough inflicted the tortures described by Plowden. See *note* 52, *supra*.

[139] The Royal Exchange, says Walpole "had been converted into a military depôt, *and was the head-quarters of the yeomanry*." *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xxi., p. 501.

in future.' "[140] The Orange party of the time, both in and out of Parliament, were in full accord with their apologist as to the employment of torture for the purpose of "exploding the rebellion."

THE DEATH-ROLL.

(3) The outrages committed by the Orange soldiery before the outbreak of hostilities in 1798, were not, however, limited to house-breaking, robbery, outrages on women, and the illegal and systematic infliction of torture. The crime of murder, on a large scale, and with every circumstance of maddening barbarity, must also be laid to the charge of "the gallant Orange yeomanry who fought in ninety-eight."

At a somewhat later period—June, 1798—Lord William Russell said from his place in the House that "a man's loyalty was to be estimated by the desire he testified to imbrue his hands in his brothers' blood."[141] The same test of loyalty apparently held good in the few feverish weeks which preceded the insurrection. Judged by this standard, the Orange soldiery were beau-ideals of loyalty. We shall see that, in the opinion of Lord Cornwallis, out of all the troops that were employed in provoking and stamping out the insurrection, the pride of place in mere murder rightly falls to the yeomanry. The crime was carried out

(*a*) Frequently after a form of mock-trial; more frequently without such a formality, principally

(*b*) By search or scouring parties, and

(*c*) By those in charge of prisoners.

Reference is here made exclusively or almost exclusively to the murder of unarmed and unresisting persons *before* the people went out from their homes to die upon the hill-sides.

(*a*) *Mock-trials.*—In his order of February 26, 1798, General Sir Ralph Abercromby referred to "the very disgraceful frequency of courts-martial."[142] Lord Holland, Walpole, and others have already been quoted to show that the proceedings of these courts were mere mockeries of justice: tortures and death being commonly inflicted without proof of guilt, for the purpose of compelling suspects to incriminate themselves or others, or for the gratification of private malice.

(*b*) Standard authorities on the period of martial law that preceded the insurrection of 1798, are agreed that shooting

---

[140] *Compendium of Irish Biography*, p. 356.

[141] Quoted by Godkin (a Protestant writer) in *The Battlefields of Ninety-eight (National Review*, June, 1868, p. 14). See also the same writer's *Land Law in Ireland*, p. 268.

[142] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xviii., p. 476; Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxii., p. 265; Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 203.

people at their doors, or as they rushed for safety out of their burning houses, formed one of the chief amusements of the military who were placed at free-quarters in the homes of the peasantry in Leinster. Lecky, referring to the "horrible abuses and horrible sufferings" inflicted by the search-parties on the unhappy peasantry, says: "Many who resisted, and not a few, it is said, who did not resist, were shot dead on their thresholds."[143] Walpole, referring to the atrocities perpetrated in Ulster, in 1797, by the Orange yeomanry and the Ancient Britons, tells how people "were hunted down and sabred," and "children brutally ill-treated and murdered."[144] In the Irish House of Commons, Dr. Browne, M.P. for Dublin University, referring to the outrages of the military and yeomanry, offered to prove that persons had been shot in cold blood.[145] Lecky, in a passage already quoted, is prepared to admit that "in the midnight raids [in Ulster, before the insurrection] many persons were shot by soldiers, *or more probably by yeomen*, in a manner that differed little, if at all, from simple murder."[146] Reference has already been made to the unprovoked massacre of men, women, and children, at Ballyholan, in Ulster, by the Newry Orange yeomanry and the "mostly Orange" Ancient Britons. Plowden and Madden give particulars of many such cases of cold-blooded murder.[147] In Wexford, Hunter Gowan's "Black Mob" of Orange yeomen shot people at their doors. They tied one man to a tree and riddled him with bullets. This occurred on May 23, 1798, and contributed much towards the rising, which took place three days later.[148] In the same county, and in the neighbouring ones, "the inhabitants were generally called to their doors, and shot without ceremony, their houses being immediately burned or plundered."[149] It is impossible to form an estimate of the numbers of persons who died under the lash, or from the effects of the various forms of torture inflicted on them during the Reign of Terror which preceded the rising.

(*c*) *Murder of prisoners.*—Two horrible massacres perpetrated, the one in Wicklow, the other in Wexford, greatly

---

[143] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 271.

[144] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xvii., p. 467.

[145] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 46, *note*.

[146] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[147] Plowden, *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 623-627; Madden, ii., 291-296.

[148] Myles Byrne, in his *Memoirs*, mentions the names of some of the victims, whom he personally knew, he having been born near the spot, at Monaseed. Cf. Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxii., p. 267.

[149] Mitchel, *ibid.*

increased the popular terror and resentment in the two counties, and undoubtedly did much to precipitate the rebellion. On May 24—two days before the rising—thirty-four prisoners were shot, without trial, at Dunlavin (County of Wicklow), "officers, to their disgrace, presiding and sanctioning the proceedings."[150] The murderers in this case were, according to Musgrave, the local yeomanry and the militia,[151] the latter being, as Hay and Madden testify, the Antrim militia, who, as we have already seen, were quartered on the people in this part of Wicklow at the time of the outbreak. On the following day—the eve of the rising—"twenty-eight fathers of families, prisoners, were shot and massacred in the Ball-alley of Carnew." "Many of the men thus inhumanly butchered had been confined on mere suspicion," says Hay. This dark deed of blood was likewise the work of the yeomen and a party of the Antrim militia. At Carnew, as at Dunlavin, the massacre was sanctioned by the officers.[152] The records of such atrocities as I have thus far been describing, drew from Lecky—a witness not over-friendly to the tortured and maddened people—the declaration that the proclamation of martial law in Leinster was not only "a proximate cause of the rebellion," but that it "opened a scene of horrors hardly surpassed in the modern history of Europe."[153]

TOO MUCH "CLEMENCY."

Evidence has already been given to show that the worst excesses of the policy of slow torture were carried on throughout the country, before the insurrection, with the full knowledge of the Government of the day.[154] Yet they were permitted to continue "without interference and without restraint."[155] There is no evidence of any effort having been ever put forth

---

[150] Hay, *History of the Insurrection*, p. 78; Byrne's *Memoirs*. Cf. Lecky, iv., 351-352. Musgrave (p. 243) admits that the massacre was resolved upon by the officers.

[151] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, p. 243. The rebellion did not begin in any part of Wicklow until after this massacre. Musgrave's statement to the contrary is made for an evident purpose, and is contradicted by every historian who has written on the subject. A detailed account of the Dunlavin affair appeared in *The Irish Magazine* in 1811 (quoted in Kavanagh's *Hist. of the Rebellion*, chap. vi., p. 76, 4th ed).

[152] *Hist. of the Insurrection*, ed. 1803, p. 76. Further details are also given in the *Memoirs* of Myles Byrne, whose home was not far from Carnew, and who declares that he "knew several of the murdered men," naming one, at whose wedding he had assisted two years before. Rev. James Gordon also mentions a massacre at Carnew, at which "fifty-four [prisoners] were shot . . . in the space of three days." *Hist. of the Rebellion*, p. 222.

[153] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 265.

[154] See *note* 134, *supra*.

[155] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 272.

by the authorities to mitigate the atrocities[156] perpetrated on a people, a great part of whom, although disturbed, would never (as in the case of Wexford) have risen in rebellion but for the havoc wrought amongst them by bullet, bayonet, brand, lash, picket, and the hangman's noose. On the contrary, some of the worst barbarities committed by the Orange soldiery in Ulster, long previous to the rising, were regarded by the Viceroy, Lord Camden, with a levity which, as Lecky points out, is "horribly significant."[157] It was the spirit which led Nero to "fiddle," as it is said, over the blackened ruins which he had made in Rome, and which made the *Sansculottes* sing and dance the Carmagnole amidst the terrors of 1789. Walpole, in his *Kingdom of Ireland* (p. 477), and Lecky, in the fourth volume of his *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (p. 330), tell how, in 1797—long before the rising—John Claudius Beresford, the Orange leader, declared in the Irish House of Commons, that "he wished they [the people] were in rebellion, to meet them face to face." General Dundas's lack of ferocity, and Sir Ralph Abercromby's order of February 26, 1797, against the "irregularities" and "licentiousness" of the army, evoked a fierce outcry from the Orange party.[158] "General Abercromby," says Barrington, "was not permitted to abate these enormities [free-quarters and slow torture], and therefore resigned with disgust. Ireland was by these means reduced to a state of anarchy, and exposed to crime and cruelties to which no nation had ever been subject. The people could no longer bear their miseries. Mr. Pitt's object was now effected, and an insurrection was excited."[159] In his *Memoirs of the Whig Party* Lord Holland says: "His [Abercromby's] recall was *hailed as a triumph by the Orange faction*. . . . Indeed, surrounded as they were with burning cottages, tortured backs, and frequent executions, they were yet full of sneers at which they whimsically termed the 'clemency' of the Government, and the weakness of their Viceroy, Lord Camden."[160] They were determined, says Walpole, to drive the people into open revolt, so as to have an excuse for "crushing them more effectually."[161] During and after the insurrection, the new Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, was contemptuously nicknamed "Croppy Corney," by the Orange party, for his attempts to mitigate the barbarities of the troops, and especially of the yeomanry.

[156] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[157] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[158] Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xviii., p. 477: Lecky, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 330.

[159] *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, ed. 1844, p. 351.

[160] *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i., p. 112.

[161] *Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 477.

END OF THE REIGN OF LAW.

Two further circumstances contributed to aggravate a situation that had already reached the farther verge of ordinary human patience. They were: First, the suppression of inquiry; second, the impossibility of obtaining legal redress.

(1) There is little doubt, says Lecky, "that the authorities did all in their power to prevent inquiry, and to hush up such abuses as actually occurred,"[162] even before the insurrection. Grattan speaks, in 1797, of "barbarities aud murders such as no printer will now dare to publish, lest he should be plundered or murdered for the ordinary exercise of his trade."[163]

(2) Legal redress for the infliction of torture, destruction of property, murder, etc., was made "almost impossible" by Indemnity Acts, which shielded "loyalists" from prosecution on account of any and every kind of barbarity which they may have committed on the people before or during the insurrection.[164]

The terror inspired by military severities before the outbreak of hostilities was extreme. "In the country," writes Lecky, "it is said that whole villages were deserted, and the inhabitants slept in the ditches and in the fields through fear of outrages from the yeomen."[165] In Ulster, which was dominated by Orange soldiery, the reign of terror began in 1797. "Villages and whole districts," says Walpole, "were devastated, and the inhabitants turned out of their homes into the ditch."[166] In Wexford county people deserted their homes in great numbers.[167] In the neighbouring county of Wicklow, according to Plowden, "the Catholic inhabitants abandoned their houses over a district extending for thirty miles, in terror of Orange outrages."[168]

HOW TO MAKE A REBEL.

The reader has already seen, in the course of this chapter, that the immediate purpose of this unrestrained military

---

[162] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 45.

[163] Grattan's *Life and Times*, by his son, vol. iv., p. 301. "Observers" *View of the Present State of Ireland*, which gave an account of Orange outrages in a part of Ulster, was, for prudential reasons, printed in London (1797). See *note* 68, pp. 28-29, *supra*. The office of the *Northern Star* was wrecked by the military because the editor had published an account of their outrages on the people. See Arthur O'Connor's letter in the *Press*, January 2, 1798, on the use of torture by the military at that period. Madden, *United Irishmen*, Second Series, vol. ii., pp. 299-304.

[164] Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 282-287.

[165] *Ibid.*, p. 276; cf. p. 269.

[166] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xvii., p. 467.

[167] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxii., pp. 267, 284; Cloney's *Personal Narrative*, quoted by Lecky, vol. iv., p. 358, *note*.

[168] *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 714-716.

ST. ALBERT'S

license was to goad the people into rebellion; its ulterior object, the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. Both purposes were duly effected. One of the first results of the military outrages was to drive large bodies of people, who had hitherto taken little or no interest in politics, into the ranks of the United Irishmen. "The persecution," says Walpole, "drove the lukewarm into their ranks, and converted them into earnest spmpathisers."[169] "It is only too certain," says the same Protestant writer, "that numbers of decent peasants and farmers, who had never troubled themselves with politics, were driven into the ranks of the United Irishmen by the ferocity of the authorities."[170] Martial law, says Lecky, "undoubtedly turned into desperate rebels *multitudes* who, if they had been left unmolested, would have been, if not loyal subjects, at least neutral spectators, or lukewarm and half-hearted rebels."[171] The *Report* of the Secret Committee of 1799, according to the same writer, "does not make sufficient allowance for the extent to which the rebellion was a mere unorganised rising of men who were driven to desperation by intolerable military tyranny."[172] The same Protestant author says of the martial law and free quarters: "The tortures, the house-burnings, and other manifold abuses that followed it, soon completed the work, and drove the people in large districts to desperation and madness."[173] There is a horrible, though not unexpected, significance in the statement of Lecky, that the Irish Government looked "almost with gratification at the outbreak of the rebellion."[174] The same writer adds that the method employed to force the people into open revolt "was largely responsible for the ferocity with which the rebellion was waged, and that it contributed enormously to the most permanent and deadly evils of Irish life."[175]

[169] *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xvii., p. 469. Cf. *note* 54, p. 26, *supra*.

[170] Walpole, *op. cit.*, chap. xviii., p. 479.

[171] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., p. 290. As far back as 1796, Under-Secretary Cooke, in a letter to Pelham, said that "the irritating conduct of the Orangemen, in keeping up the persecution against the Catholics, does infinite mischief. It has been made the handle for seducing many of the militia." Quoted by Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 455.

[172] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 289. Joseph Holt, one of the insurgent leaders, is a notable case in point. He was a loyal and prosperous Protestant farmer in Wicklow county, until one day, on his return home, "he found his house a smoking ruin, his effects pillaged, and his wife and family turned into the ditch. He himself fled for his life into the Wicklow mountains." Walpole, chap. xx., p. 490. Cf. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v., pp. 82-84.

[173] Lecky, *ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 291.

[174] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

[175] *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290; cf. p. 342. Holt, the insurgent leader, says in

RETALIATION.

The outrages committed by the maddened people during the course of that desperate struggle were, as might be expected in the circumstances, both numerous and dreadful. It should, however, be remembered that in nearly every case

(*a*) They were committed by the humbler classes, who were without regular military discipline, and fighting for the right to live;

(*b*) They were acts of retaliation for the outrages of the military, and especially of the Orange soldiery;

(*c*) They did not extend, as we have seen, to outrages on women;

(*d*) They were not sanctioned by the leaders of the revolt.[176]

Mr. Bouverie-Pusey, who describes himself as "a convinced Protestant," writes that, in forming a judgment on this subject of retaliation by the insurgents, "we ought also to remember the cruelties committed on the disaffected peasantry under the name of martial law, and the excesses of the Orangemen mentioned above. About all that can be said in favour of one side rather than another is that the rebels seldom or never outraged women, whilst the Royalists did; and that cruelties committed by rebels belonging to the humblest class—commanded by leaders of no more education than themselves, with no regular military organisation or system of punishment, and almost necessarily joined by large numbers of lawless characters—are not altogether as deserving of censure as those of regular or semi-regular troops, who ought to be kept under fixed control by the Government they serve. Of course, where the rebels have themselves constituted a Government, the distinction falls to the ground; but in Ireland, in 1798, this was not the case." Having referred to the fearful cruelties committed by the troops, the same writer concludes: "The excuses which have been made for the actions of the yeo-

---

his *Memoirs* (edited by Crofton Croker, 2 vols., 1838): "It was private wrongs and individual oppression, quite unconnected with the Government, which gave the bloody and inveterate character to the rebellion in the county of Wicklow" (p. 18). The same is true of the Wexford rising.

[176] The first general proclamation issued to the rebel forces contained the following: "Let it be proclaimed to the extremity of our land, that insult to female honour, contempt of orders, pillage and desertion, shall be punished with death." The general orders issued to the Wexford insurgents, June 6, 1798, declared: "Any person or persons who shall take upon them to kill or murder any person or prisoner, burn any house, or commit any plunder, without special written orders from the Commander-in-chief, shall suffer death." Kavanagh's *Hist. of the Rebellion.*

manry, etc., were such as might with quite equal force be made for the Reign of Terror in France."[177]

Lecky, who cannot be accused of any bias in favour of the insurgents, has the following in a *critique* on Froude:

"Of the atrocities committed by the rebels during the bloody month when the rebellion was at its highest, it is difficult to speak too strongly, but an impartial historian would not have forgotten that they were perpetrated by undisciplined men, driven to madness by a long course of savage cruelties, and, in most cases, without the knowledge or approval of their leaders; that from the beginning of the struggle the yeomen rarely gave quarter to the rebels; that, with the one horrible exception of Scullabogue, the rebels in their treatment of women contrasted most favourably and most remarkably with the troops; and that one of the earliest episodes of the struggle was the butchery near Kildare of 350 insurgents, who had surrendered on the express promise that their lives should be spared."[178]

No such atrocities had been perpetrated on the people who later on joined the French invaders in Connaught. Although a large range of country lay for many days at their mercy, the Protestant Bishop of Killala (Dr. Stock), who was witness to what he states, declares that "during the whole time of this civil commotion not a drop of blood was shed by the Connaught rebels, except in the field of war."[179]

THE REIGN OF TERROR.

Thus far, reference has been made to certain phases in the conduct of the Orange soldiery before the rising of 1798. This chapter would be incomplete without at least a brief notice of the methods by which they aided the regular troops in stamp-

---

[177] Bouverie-Pusey, *The Past History of Ireland*, pp. 110-111.

[178] Quoted in Justin H. McCarthy's *Outline of Irish History*, pp. 73-74. On the question of retaliation by the insurgents consult Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv., pp. 394, 445, 456, 459, 468; *History of the Irish People* by O'Conor, 2nd ed., pp. 256-257; Walpole, chap. xx., pp. 492, 497; Mitchel, vol. i., chap. xxxv., pp. 293, 296-298. See *note* 179, *infra*. Cf. Bouverie-Pusey's *Past History of Ireland*, pp. 110-111.

[179] *A Narrative of what passed at Killala*, p. 25, quoted by Lecky, vol. v., p. 55. Lecky ascribes the good conduct of the Connaught rebels to the fact that "the people had not been driven to madness by flogging and house-burning" (p. 54). Rev. James Gordon likewise attributes the different behaviour of the Eastern and Western insurgents to the difference of treatment meted out to the people in Leinster and Connaught. He remarks, in continuation, that free-quarters, house-burnings, torture, such as "croppings, pitch-cappings, and half-hangings, must, whether necessary or not, whether deserved or not, be expected to kindle a spirit of revenge in the sufferers and their party." See *note* 182, *infra*, and Sydney Smith's *Peter Plymley's Letters*, letter viii.

ing out the rebellion which they themselves had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about. A few instances in point will serve to indicate the temper with which the work of repression was carried out.

Captain Bagot's and Lord Roden's yeomanry took the chief part in the massacre of some 350 insurgents who had surrendered their arms, under promise of protection, at what is known to this day as the Place of Slaughter, on the Curragh of Kildare.[180] According to Hay, the day after the outbreak in Wexford, the yeomanry sallied forth in the northern part of that county, "burned numbers of houses, and put to death hundreds of persons who were unarmed, unoffending, and unresisting."[181] The same writer records the massacre and mutilation of men, women, and children by the Gorey yeomanry on the day that is still remembered in North Wexford as "Bloody Friday."[182] Rev. James Gordon states that the people in the district where these atrocities were perpetrated were the last to take part in the rising, and the least violent of all the insurgents.[183] A case that excited considerable interest at this period was the barbarous murder of a sick youth, Thomas Doherty, in his mother's arms, by a yeoman named Wollaghan. The case was tried by Orange judges, presided over by the chief leader of the Irish lodges, the Earl of Enniskillen. The fact of the

[180] Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. i., p. 22, *note;* cf. vol. i., chap. xxiii., p. 280. Like the Verners, Blackers, and Enniskillens, the Roden family were intimately associated with Orangeism from an early date in its history ("M.P.," pp. 185, 226, 230). For an account of the barbarities practised upon the Kildare people by the Orange yeomanry, etc., see Madden's *United Irishmen*, Third Series, vol. ii., Appendix 8, pp. 341-342.

[181] *Hist. of the Insurrection*, p. 89.

[182] *Ibid.*, pp. 133-135, 275-276: Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. xxxv., p. 301. Gordon admits that the Gorey yeomen shot some of their prisoners. He does not specifically mention the massacre of Bloody Friday. His silence on this subject may be accounted for (1) by the fact that his son was Lieutenant in the incriminated corps; (2) by his avowed personal bias. He describes himself in his *History* as "wholly British by descent," and with a natural bias on the side of Protestantism and loyalty." In the preface to the second edition of his *History of the Rebellion*, he states (p. x.) that his sons were Orangemen. His *History of Ireland*, published in 1806, is described by the Protestant writer Lowndes as "a party work, abounding in misrepresentation" (*Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*). (3). Motives of prudence might be assigned as a further possible explanation of Gordon's silence regarding the affair of Bloody Friday. He lived in the midst of the incriminated yeomen, and his *History of the Rebellion* was published in 1801, while the ferocious spirit engendered by the insurrection was still abroad among his party.

[183] *Hist. of the Rebellion*, p. 104 (1st ed.) The Protestant writer Taylor refers to the address of loyalty presented by the Catholics of Ballycanew, a small town near Gorey, on the 1st of April, 1798, a few weeks before the rising. *The Rebellion in Wexford*, pp. 21-22.

murder was admitted. The defence only pleaded that it was committed by Wollaghan under the following order from his commanding officer: That if any yeoman on a scouring party should meet with any whom he knew, *or suspected*, to be a rebel, he need not be at the trouble of bringing him in, but was to shoot him on the spot.[184] This, together with another strikingly similar case of yeoman barbarity, is also recorded in the *Memoirs and Correspondence* of Lord Cornwallis. Referring to the yeomanry and militia of the period, the *Memoirs* say: "Among these corps an impression existed that it was perfectly justifiable to put to death, without even the form of a trial, any man who was known, *or even suspected*, to have been a rebel." The writer adds that officers "sometimes joined in, and frequently defended, these atrocious proceedings."[185] A few brief extracts from the letters of this humane and distinguished Viceroy will give the reader a grim idea of the ferocious spirit which dominated the yeomanry and militia forces and the Orange ascendency party of the day. In a letter to the Duke of Portland, June 28, 1798, he refers to the "ferocity" of the Irish troops, which, he added, "is not confined to the private soldiers."[186] He scouts the idea that "Catholicism" is the cause of the rebellion.[187] In another letter he writes: "The violence of our friends, and their folly in endeavouring to make it a religious war, added to the ferocity of our troops, who delight in murder, most powerfully counteract all plans of reconciliation."[188] In a subsequent letter to Major-General

[184] Plowden, *Hist. Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 810; *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 113. Plowden adds (*ibid.*), "this order, and the constant acting up to it by the corps, was proved by one private, one sergeant, and two lieutenants of yeomanry." He also states that the judges were Orangemen. Wollaghan was acquitted; but the Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, censured the court-martial, had Wollaghan discharged from the yeomanry, and prevented Enniskillen and the other officers who had tried the murderer from sitting any more on courts-martial. The Viceroy's letter is dated October 18, 1798, and is given in full in Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i, Introd., pp. 114-115.

[185] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis*, vol. ii., pp. 420-421.

[186] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 355.

[187] *Ibid.* The commander-in-chief of the Wexford insurgents, Bagenal Harvey, and others of their leaders, were Protestants. So were by far the greater part of the leaders of the United Irish Society. See p. 26, *supra*, *note*. Holt, the most daring and resourceful leader of the Wicklow insurgents, was likewise a Protestant.

[188] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis*, vol. ii., p. 355; cf. p. 377. Lord Cornwallis is referring to the insurrection in Leinster, which spread over four counties: Wicklow, Wexford, Carlow and Kildare. The Irish militia regiments who were stationed in these counties before the outbreak, and who signalised themselves most, both then and subsequently, for their cruelties, were: in Wexford the largely Orange North Cork militia (see pp. 269-271, *supra*); in the other counties, certain regi-

Ross, July 24, 1798, he refers to "the innumerable murders that are hourly committed by our people without any process or examination whatever. The yeomanry are in the style of the loyalists in America, only much more numerous and powerful, and a thousand times more ferocious. *They take the lead in rapine and murder.*" The Irish militia, he immediately adds, "follow closely in the heels of the yeomanry in every kind of atrocity."[189] An idea of one thing meant by Cornwallis by "taking the lead in murder" may be gathered from his letter of June 28, 1798, to Portland. He writes:

"The accounts that you see of the number of the enemy destroyed in every action, are, I conclude, greatly exaggerated; for my own knowledge of military affairs, I am sure that a very small proportion of them could be killed in battle, and I am much afraid that any man in a brown coat that is found within several miles of the field of action, is butchered without discrimination."[190]

The statements of the Viceroy are corroborated by Rev. James Gordon, as regards Wexford county, which had suffered most of all from the ferocity of the yeomanry, the North Cork and the Ulster militia regiments, and the "mostly Orange" Ancient Britons. In his *History of the Rebellion* this author says: "I have reason to think that more men than fell in battle were slain in cold blood. No quarter was given to persons taken prisoners as rebels, with or without arms. For instance: fifty-four were shot in the little town of Carnew in the space of three days."[191] A grim idea of the ferocity of the

ments raised in the notably Orange districts of Ulster. The Armagh and Tyrone militia, together with a detachment of the North Corks, were stationed in Carlow county. Some of the proceedings of the Tyrone Orange militia have been already referred to in this chapter (p. 268). The Antrim militia were stationed in Wicklow. They took part with the local yeomanry in the massacres of Dunlavin and Carnew. On the open plains of Kildare the rebellion was suppressed almost as soon as it arose. In his letter to Portland, July 8, 1798, Cornwallis says that the militia are cowards, "but ferocious and cruel in the extreme when any poor wretches, either with or without arms, come within their power; in short, murder appears to be their favourite pastime" (ii., 357). Cf. Lord Holland's *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i., pp. 111-112.

[189] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis*, vol. ii, p. 369.

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 355. See the account given in Byrne's *Memoirs* of the murders committed by the runaway yeomanry after the battle of Oulart Hill. The writer, as a boy, heard the details of these proceedings from a venerable resident of the spot, John Cooney, who had witnessed the battle.

[191] P. 222. Contemporary Catholic writers and constant local tradition in so far bear out Cornwallis's statements, by uniformly attributing the principal share in cold-blooded massacre to the yeomanry, the militia regiments mentioned above being, in sporting phrase, "a good second." The stigma of blood-thirstiness is not attached to any notable extent to the

Orange yeomanry of the period is furnished by an incident related by Under-Secretary Cooke in a letter to Wickham, dated July 28, 1798. Some seventy persons had been placed on their trial on the capital charge of rebellion or disaffection. There was no evidence against them, and they were liberated. This act of natural justice excited the indignation of the Orange party and the yeomanry. "Our zealots and yeomen," Cooke writes, "do not relish this compromise, and there has been a fine buzz on the subject."[192]

A spirit not less ferocious pervaded the ascendency party, which included the whole Orange society, and was headed by the notorious Beresfords, of Riding-house fame. Lord Cornwallis says of them in his letter of July 9, 1798, to the Duke of Portland (already quoted), that they "would pursue measures that could only terminate in the extirpation of the greater number of the inhabitants, and in the utter destruction of the country. The words Papists and Priests are for ever in their mouths, and by their unaccountable policy they would drive four-fifths of the community into irreconcileable rebellion."[193] Elsewhere, the same distinguished Protestant nobleman tells how the conversation of the same party, even at his table, reeked of blood, and how they rejoiced when news was brought that a priest had been put to death."[194] Seventeen months after the outbreak of the tortured and maddened people had been quelled, he makes use of words which go far to show that the ascendency faction had frankly entered upon a war of proscription against Catholics, such as the first lodges had inaugurated in 1795. He writes: "The greatest difficulty

---

English regiments drafted into Ireland to suppress the rising. Gordon (p. 136) recounts an incident which was witnessed by his son, a yeomanry officer, after the encounter of Ballycanew, near Gorey. A yeoman, after having wounded a child with a musket shot, urged his companion, another yeoman, to fire also. The incident, though trifling, is significant of the temper of the men. An official *Memorandum* on Wicklow county, August 20, 1798, admits that even then, after the close of the rebellion, "acts of violence and revenge from the lower orders of yeomen have excited great alarm." *Cornwallis Correspondence*, vol. ii., pp. 385-386. General Sir John Moore, like Lord Cornwallis and General Sir Ralph Abercromby, indignantly protested against the barbarities committed upon the peasantry in 1798. "If I were an Irishman" said Sir John, "I would be a rebel."

[192] Incorporated with the *Cornwallis Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 376.

[193] *Ibid.*, p. 358. Compare the Orange use of the word Papist, *supra*, p. 158. Arthur O'Connor, the anti-Catholic leader of the United Irishmen, in his letter to the *Press* of January 2, 1798, describes the Orangemen as "a lawless banditti of *sworn extirpators*." Madden's *United Irishmen*, Second Series, vol. ii. p. 300.

[194] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis*, vol. ii., p. 369, letter to Major-General Ross, July 24, 1798. The insurrection was at this time over.

which I experience, is to control our loyal friends, who would, if I did not keep the strictest hand upon them, convert the system of martial law (which, God knows, is of itself bad enough) into a more violent and intolerable tyranny than that of Robespierre. The vilest informers are hunted out from the prisons to attack, by the most barefaced perjury, the lives of all who are *suspected* of being, or having been, disaffected; and, indeed, every Roman Catholic of influence is in great danger." "I attempt," he adds, "to moderate that violence and cruelty which has once driven, and which, if tolerated, *will again drive this wretched country into rebellion.*"[195]

It would be easy to multiply quotations of this character from the letters of Lord Cornwallis, and from the works of other Protestant writers, as to the temper of the Orange party before and during the insurrection, and after the last fires of the revolt had been quenched in blood. Even in those wild days the leaders of the party threw over the workings of the fierce spirit of the institution the thin drapery of "qualifications requisite for an Orangeman." The following is one of the many estimable qualities which the society nominally required of the Orange yeoman and civilian in those times: "Of an humane and compassionate disposition, and a courteous and affable behaviour, he should be an utter enemy to savage brutality and unchristian cruelty."

THE PIPING TIME OF PEACE.

The Irish Orange yeomanry never quite lost the taste for blood and outrage with which they had familiarised themselves from 1796 to the close of 1799. The subsequent course of their history is punctuated at short and frequent intervals with outbursts of their old passions, which recall the wild days when they raged with sword, fire, lash, gibbet, and sharpened stake, in Leinster and the North. A long-suffering people fretted helplessly under their turbulence and disloyalty, until, in the end, the force was suppressed in the interests of public peace. A few facts, selected out of many, will serve to give an idea of the temper of the yeomanry forces from the close of the rebellion onwards. I shall confine myself to three of the most serious crimes of which a military body of professional loyalists could well be guilty, namely:

1. Murder and manslaughter;
2. Riotous behaviour;
3. Mutiny.

1 and 2. On July 14, 1802, several unoffending people were shot by the Dublin yeomanry. Their officers connived at the

[195] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 145.

deed by declining all inquiry into it.[196] Four years later—in 1806—one Alexander Bell, a private in Colonel (then Major) Blacker's Orange yeomanry, made two brutal and very nearly successful attempts—one with a bayonet, the other with a hatchet—to murder a Catholic man named Birmingham. Our old friend, Colonel Blacker (who had been an Orangeman since 1795), allowed the would-be murderer to escape.[197] After three years (in 1809) the culprit was brought to justice. Baron McClelland, before whom he was tried, declared that the case was "one of peculiar atrocity," and that "the prisoner was convicted on the clearest testimony." Immediately after the trial Mr. Blacker waited on the judge, and requested him to commute the punishment to transportation, on the extraordinary plea—amounting to a threat—"that the prosecutors and those who had assisted in the prosecution would be murdered by the friends of the prisoner, if the prisoner was executed."[198] Bell was, nevertheless, hanged. And so little faith did the Government of the day place in the loyalty of the Orange yeomanry, that, in anticipation of an attempt on their part to rescue their comrade, five hundred men of the 90th regiment, a troop of dragoons, and a detachment of the royal artillery, with their field pieces, were drafted to Portadown for the occasion.[199]

In 1806, an Orangeman was placed under arrest for the murder of a diminutive tailor. He was rescued, on his way to jail, by two of the Benburb Orange yeomen. One of them with a drawn sword, and the other with a cocked pistol, threatened the life of the constable unless he released his prisoner.[200] Mr. Wilson, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, who relates the incident, appealed to the commanding officer of the Benburb yeomanry to apprehend the rescuers. The officer sanctioned their conduct by declining to interfere, and neither they nor the murderer were ever brought to justice.

In April of the same year (1806), Colonel Verner's Orange yeomanry burned and plundered the house of an unoffending Catholic hatter named Constantine O'Neill, and fired several shots at him and his wife. The culprits (who were said to have included the Colonel's own sons) were never brought to

---

[196] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. iii., pp. 760-761.

[197] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Q. 9300.

[198] Letter of Baron McClelland to the Government, dated August 1, 1809, given in full in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 116-117.

[199] Plowden says that 1100 yeomen assembled in the neighbourhood for the purpose of rescuing the murderer. *Ireland from its Union*, vol. iii., p. 762.

[200] Mr. Wilson was an English Protestant gentleman resident in Ulster. For further particulars regarding him, see chap. xiv., *infra*.

justice. The results of this miscarriage of justice are thus stated by Mr. Wilson, in a memorial addressed by him to the Chief Secretary, bearing date July 1, 1806: "Many daring and atrocious violences have been committed against these poor people [the Catholics] by a banditti calling themselves yeomen and Orangemen, who, with arms in their hands, bid defiance to the law and its ministers."[201]

At the July demonstration in 1808, Father Duane, parish priest of Mountrath, was barbarously murdered in his own house by a body of three hundred Orange yeomen. The following year a Catholic man named Cavanagh was murdered by the same body at the same place; and on the same first of July a priest was shot at his own house by armed yeomanry at Bailieborough, in the county of Cavan. In none of these instances were the murderers brought to justice.[202] At Corinshiga, near Newry, eighteen yeomen "fully armed and accoutred," without the slightest pretence at provocation, fired into what fourteen local Protestant magistrates termed a defenceless crowd of "men, women and children, occupied in an innocent and usual recreation." One person—a youth named McKeown—was killed; others were severely wounded. The murderers were never brought to justice. A few days later their comrades, on returning from parade, fired a volley, by way of bravado, over the house occupied by McKeown, the father of the murdered boy.[203]

In 1810 a man named Geehan, and a Quaker lady (Miss Martin) were deliberately, and without the slightest provocation, done to death by the Enniscorthy yeomanry. Such was the demoralisation of the force that, although the murderers were well known, no proceedings were taken against them.[204] On the eve of July 12th, in the following year (1811), the local yeomanry engaged in a street row at Derrygonnelly, in the

[201] Wilson's *Letters*, p. 31. Rev. Dr. Conwell, in pressing for a proper investigation into this outrage, said to Mr. Sergeant Moore, one of the law-officers of the Crown, that "he only wanted such an investigation as might be the means of permitting his people [the Catholics] to live in peace, but that it was well known that the inhabitants in Mr. Verner's neighbourhood stood in such dread of that gentleman and his yeomen and his Orangemen, that they would not dare to state anything which could affect him or his party." Quoted by "M.P.," p. 121.

[202] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. iii., pp. 762-763.

[203] *Ibid.*, pp. 712-714. Plowden gives in full a copy of the reward offered for such information as would lead to the conviction of the offenders. Fourteen magistrates each contributed £22 15s. towards the reward. The bond of lodge rule, however, coupled with the favour shown to the Orange society by the anti-Catholic Richmond administration, defeated the ends of justice.

[204] *Ibid.*, pp. 887-888.

county of Fermanagh. Finding themselves unequal to the opposing faction, they retreated to their barracks, seized their muskets, returned, and fired upon the people. One man was killed outright. Kitson, the yeoman who shot him, absconded to America. On his return to the district, he was acquitted by an Orange jury.[205]

On midsummer-eve, 1830, a body of armed Orangemen, whose movements suggested the presence of yeomanry, surrounded a field in which a number of young people were, with the owner's permission, enjoying an innocent annual festival.[206] One of the Orangemen killed a Catholic named McGlade with a dagger. Several other members of the group of merry-makers were also stabbed or otherwise wounded by the Orange assailants. Through the friendly verdict of a jury of Orangemen, two of the attacking party, who had been put on their trial for murder, got off with twelve months' imprisonment each. On their release, one of them was taken into the police force, on the recommendation of Dean Carter, an Orangeman noted for his violence in those days. The other was admitted to membership of Dr. Patten's Orange yeomanry of Tanderagee. Dean Carter—who was a magistrate—refused to receive the informations sworn against the other accomplices of the midsummer-eve tragedy.[207] It would be an easy, if ungracious, task to multiply instances of yeomanry outrages, which, through the criminal connivance of the officers, and the active sympathy of the Orange magistrates, were allowed to go unpunished.

In the course of the celebrated charge which he delivered at the Wexford Summer Assizes in 1814, Judge Fletcher tells of the demoralisation and turbulance which he had

---

[205] See *Minutes of Evidence*, Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, Qq. 7313, *sqq.*, p. 75. The local magistrates refused to take the necessary depositions for Kitson's arrest. They were severely reprimanded for their conduct by Judge Osborne at the ensuing assizes. I find in my notes a quotation from the *Times* of June 14, 1813, telling how, on the 27th of the previous month, "an honest, industrious tradesman" named Phil Mahon was treacherously stabbed through the back, at Clones, with a bayonet, by an "Orange yeoman," one Thomas Rooney. "Another loyal Orange yeoman" came up and, with his bayonet, mangled the dead body of Mahon.

[206] Mr. McConnell, one of the witnesses examined by the Select Committee of 1835, says (Q. 6389) there was no distinction of party or sect at the little celebration, and believes that both Protestants and Catholics took part in it.

[207] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Qq. 6388, *sqq.*; cf. 3217, 3325, etc. Details of the McCuster outrage are given at Q. 7336. Yeomen broke into McCuster's house, broke his arms and legs, and were allowed to get off scot-free by an Orange jury. The matter was ventilated in Parliament.

himself witnessed among the Orange yeomanry of Ulster. "There," said he, "*those disturbers of the public peace, who assume the name of Orange yeomen*, frequent the fairs and markets, with arms in their hands, under the pretence of self-defence, or of protecting the public peace, but with the lurking views of inviting attacks from the Ribbonmen, confident that, armed as they are, they must overcome defenceless opponents and put them down. *Murders have been repeatedly perpetrated on such occasions*, and, though legal prosecutions have ensued, yet, such have been the baneful consequences of these factious associations, that, under their influence, petty juries have declined, upon some occasions, to do their duty. These *facts have fallen under my own view.*"[208]

NO-POPERY *plus* MUTINY.

3. The No-Popery cry and the anti-Emancipation agitation were enthusiastically taken up by the Orange yeomanry, and furnished the occasion for many acts of mutiny and violence on their part. A few instances in point will suffice. During the No-Popery agitation of 1809, the Bandon Orange yeomanry (numbering 600 men) mutinied twice on parade—once on the first of July, and again on the sixth. On the former occasion they marched through the town, wearing Orange lilies, etc., in their uniforms, contrary to military regulations. The officers, "expecting there would be some disturbance and insult offered to the Catholic inhabitants," got before them and gave them the order to dismiss. They refused to obey. Their commanding officer, the Earl of Bandon—a strong supporter of Orangeism—reported to head-quarters regarding the subsequent parade, that, "to show their defiance, they [the yeomen] all wore Orange lilies on parade on the sixth." They were reprimanded for their conduct by the Earl of Bandon and Colonel Oriel, and ordered either to lay aside their Orange emblems or to ground their arms. *They threw down their arms and accoutrements.* By the military laws then in force, the mutinous yeomen were guilty of felony. The only punishment inflicted on them was the disbandment of the corps. The official correspondence of the Earl of Bandon with the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in Ireland on the conduct of the Bandon and Ballyaneen corps gives an interesting picture of the bigotry and demoralisation of the Munster yeomanry at this period.[209]

---

[208] *Judge Fletcher's Charge*, Irish Press Agency, 1886.

[209] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. iii., pp. 763-765. See also *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report* of 1835, and "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, pp. 137-138; also App. B1, Irish *Report*, pp. 18 *sqq.*

At the Kilkenny Summer Assizes in 1810, Edward Howard, an Orangeman and member of Mathews' yeomanry corps, was put upon his trial for the murder of a Catholic youth named William Butler. One of the witnesses for the defence—a comrade of the prisoner's—admitted on cross-examination that every man in the corps was a sworn Orangeman, and that both he and all his fellows understood themselves to be released from their oath of allegiance to the King, should his Majesty consent to grant Catholic Emancipation.[210]

In the same year (1810) the Bann and Warringstown Orange yeomanry threw down their arms and belts rather than parade with the Scarvagh corps, *because there were six Catholics in its ranks*. The Scarvagh (Upper Iveagh) corps joined in the mutiny in the hopes of thus getting their six Catholic comrades dismissed. Mutiny in this, as in most other similar cases, was encouraged, and demoralisation fomented, by being permitted to go almost wholly unpunished. Only one man in the three rebellious corps was dismissed.[211] A similar act of mutiny occurred in the Moira yeomanry corps. Their commanding officer, Mr. W. S. Crawford, M.P., in his examination before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, declined to say that the Irish yeomanry had any inclination for "supporting the laws."[212]

During the Emancipation agitation instances occurred in which the Ulster yeomanry mutinied against officers who had signed petitions in favour of the Catholic claims. Lieutenant Barnes, a Presbyterian officer of the Armagh yeomanry, having signed such a petition, the men under his command absolutely refused to serve unless he were dismissed for his display of kindly feeling towards his Catholic fellow-countrymen. The mutineers were dismissed by Lieutenant-General Mackenzie. The remainder of the corps were mustered again. They also mutinied on parade. In a history of the city of Armagh, James Stuart, an Orange writer, thus describes what took place: "The corps was re-assembled, and the officers used

[210] In the case of *The King at the prosecution of Butler v. Howard.* Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. iii., pp. 756-757. Plowden's work was published in 1811, and contains copy of verdict, newspaper extract, etc., regarding the case.

[211] See Plowden, *op. cit.*, pp. 890-891; cf. *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report* of 1835; "M.P.," p. 138. The incident related above was made the subject of an official report to the Government by Brigade-Major Wallace, who details the efforts made by himself, and other officers and gentlemen present, "to convince the men of the enormity of such behaviour as an armed body, and the fatal consequences to the public service, as well as the great illiberality and impolicy of entertaining such sentiments and feelings for our Catholic fellow-subjects."

[212] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 5803.

every argument which prudence and *loyalty* could have suggested to bring the malcontents to a due sense of their misconduct. *Every effort proved abortive.*"[213] The rebellious corps had to be disbanded.

In May, 1828, an anti-Emancipation riot took place at Lurgan. The houses of many Catholics were wrecked. The Riot Act was read by Mr. Handcock, a Protestant magistrate, who subsequently narrated the day's proceedings before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835. The magistrates called on one Douglas, the permanent sergeant of the local Orange yeomanry, to assemble his men, as in duty bound, to suppress the riot. Douglas refused, and punctuated his refusal with a personal insult to Mr. Handcock. As a matter of fact, Douglas's men were at the time in the thick of the tumult, and the magistrates found it necessary to remove the yeomanry weapons from his custody. Nine of the rioters were arrested. On their way to Portadown jail they were accompanied by the local Orange band, playing the party melodies which the brethren love to hear.[214]

Before the passing of the Emancipation Bill, and for some time afterwards, by command of the Viceroy, the Duke of Northumberland, strict orders were issued that the yeomen were not to take part in Orange processions, even in the garb of private citizens. Participation in such displays was subsequently made illegal in Ireland by the Party Processions Act of 1832. The Killyman, Cameroy, and other Ulster yeomanry, officers and men, according to the official evidence of Lord Gosford and others, flouted both the military regulations and the Act of Parliament.[215] Their turbulence, combined with their skill in the use of weapons, made them the most formidable element in the illegal and violent Orange assemblies which for years defied the forces of the Crown, and spread terror over the face of Ulster.[216] Their conduct from 1825 to 1835 led Sir Frederick Stoven, a Protestant Inspector-General

---

[213] *Ibid.*, Qq. 3334, 3773-3774; Appendix of Irish *Report*, pp. 80-81.

[214] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Qq. 7913 *sqq.* The riot arose in this way: A report had been spread in Lurgan that the Catholic Bill had been thrown out in Committee. Flags were hoisted on the church of Rev. Holt Waring—an Orange clergyman noted for his violence in those days; an Orange mob paraded the streets; and then the house-wrecking began. Cf. Qq. 7922, 7937.

[215] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Q. 8070. Colonel Blacker, our informant for the Diamond affair, was one of the offending "loyalists." See Appendices B, Third Irish *Report*.

[216] Yeomanry muskets, swords, bayonets, etc., appear to have been very frequently carried in processions or incursions of Orangemen not in uniform. This was the case, for instance, at Annahagh, in 1835, at Dun-

of Constabulary, to thus refer to them before the Parliamentary Committee on Orange lodges that for the past ten years they were "quite useless, and more than useless in my opinion; I think they are dangerous."[217] In August, 1835, Mr. Hume declared in the House of Commons that the Irish yeomanry were "all Orange."

WERE THEY LOYAL?

The history of the Orange soldiery presents few, if any, actions of which loyalty can be stated with certainty to be the sole, or even the principal, guiding motive. Their conduct, as a body, is wholly inconsistent with their claim or title of loyalty. Their behaviour before, during, and for long after the insurrection which they did so much to provoke in 1798, is quite in keeping with a cruel and vindictive hatred of four-fifths of their fellow-countrymen, with a disregard of civil and military law and natural right, and with a lack of common human feeling which surpasses that of the Jacobins of France, or of the troops whom the Duke of Alva let loose upon a *foreign* people in the Netherlands. No friend of peace and good order can regret the disappearance of the Orange yeomanry corps from Irish public life. The mantle of their spirit has happily not fallen on any military organisation that now wears the uniform of the British army. If we seek for their counterpart in the Europe of our day, we must look for it among the Turkish irregulars who have repeated, in Bulgaria and Armenia, the atrocities which desolated a portion of Ireland at the close of the last century, and which led to the bitter struggle that has left an enduring mark on Irish life and character.

---

gannon, and many other places. *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, Qq. 3474, 3613, etc.

[217] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 4778. Cf. Qq. 4211-4212, 7315-7317, 8799. See also Qq. 4340, 4341, 4550, 5349, 5628-5630, 9386, which show that at that time the greater part of the yeomanry were Orangemen.

Chapter XIV.

LOYALTY OF THE ORANGE SOCIETY: ORANGE MAGISTRATES AND JURORS—BENCH, BAR, AND PARLIAMENT SPEAK—"POISONING THE FOUNTS OF JUSTICE": "THE LAW AN INSTRUMENT OF TYRANNY"—"REFORM THE MAGISTRACY OF IRELAND, MY LORD"—AN ULSTER ENDEMIC: A CROP OF CASES AND A PRESCRIPTION.

In the course of his inaugural address on the American Constitution, Thomas Jefferson said that one of the fundamental principles which had guided his country "through an age of revolution and reformation" was, "equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political." Every well-regulated nation places the administration of justice, as far as possible, above the reach even of suspicion; and there are few greater signs of loss of moral fibre among a people than venality or partisanship seated shamelessly on the judicial bench or in the jury-box. The essence of persecution is injustice, not cruelty. Cruelty is but an aggravating circumstance, which deepens the wrong and the *sense* of wrong, and stimulates to feelings of revenge. The circumstances ordinarily surrounding the administration of justice forbid this function being regarded as a merely civic duty, unrelated to a higher law. Even in the eyes of the State, the justice on the bench fulfils a sacred office. He is invested with it only after, and on condition of, the performance of a solemn act of religion: to wit, an oath before high Heaven that he will faithfully discharge the trust bestowed upon him. Under the British Crown every justice is required to "sincerely promise and swear" as follows: "I will at all times and in all things do equal justice to the poor and to the rich, and discharge the duties of my office according to law, and to the best of my knowledge and ability, without fear, favour, or affection. So help me God." Jurors, after having been empannelled, are sworn to "well and truly try the issue, and a true verdict give according to the evidence."[1]

[1] There is a slight difference in the wording of the jurors' oath in cases of felony, misdemeanour, and civil cases. See Harris, *Principles of the Criminal Law*, 6th ed., p. 412.

It will be borne in mind that two chief elements in what is termed the "basis" of Orangeism are the support, maintenance and defence of the laws and constitution of the country. An Orange newspaper, the Dublin *Daily Express*, thought it "a libel on the British Constitution" that it should need the services of a secret society to uphold it.[2] The Melbourne *Argus*—which no one will venture to accuse of undue leniency to Catholics—found food for merriment in the idea of the same organisation preparing to "defend" four-fifths of the population of the colony from the "encroachments" of the remaining fifth. The phrases "maintenance of the law," "defence of the Constitution," are intended by the brethren principally to beguile the public ear.[3] There is nothing in the practice of the lodges which bears out these professions. There is very much that contradicts them. This may be seen by reference to the lodge proceedings which were brought to light by the Parliamentary Committees of 1835, and by the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857. The professions of loyalty just referred to are but bits of fine declamation in which secret societies are apt to indulge for the purpose of cloaking other objects. They resemble the agreeable nonsense-talk or "patter" of the professional conjurer, the scope of which is to tickle the minds of the audience, and to turn away their attention from what the "professor" and his assistants are really about.

In the course of the last four chapters I have dealt in some detail with the manner in which the rank and file of the Orange society, and many of its leaders, "maintained and supported the laws of their country." The special purpose of this chapter is to inquire into the conduct of those members of the association who were more especially charged with the administration of the law, namely: Orange magistrates and Orange jurors. In appraising at its true worth the loyalty of the Orange organisation, it will be interesting to see to what extent these two responsible classes of its members have been guided in their official action by obedience to law, respect for personal right, regard for the sanctity of their oaths.

GUILTY KNOWLEDGE.

The shadow of judicial crime has followed the steps of the Orange society through every stage of its history. For over a hundred years the disregard of Orange magistrates and jurors for their oaths has been public and notorious. It constitutes

[2]Quoted by "M. P.," *History of Orangeism*, p. 238. Lord Palmerston gave utterance to almost precisely similar sentiments, in replying to a deputation of Irish Orangemen. See *note* 66, *infra*.

[3]See pp. 143 *sqq*.

to this day a grave scandal in the administration of justice in those portions of the province of Ulster in which Orangeism still remains a power. The partiality of the brethren on the bench and in the jury-box has been the theme of debates and motions in Parliament; it has been referred to, time and again, in terms of scathing rebuke from the judicial bench, and of indignant protest from the bar; it has been the subject of reports by magistrates, Royal Commissions, Parliamentary Committees; it has on several occasions compelled even a partisan Executive to dismiss some of the most flagrant offenders from the Commission of the Peace, and to make other attempts to mitigate this grave and old-standing public scandal. Exposure, protest, official action, have been alike in vain. The evil continues rampant in Ulster to this hour. Nor can it be pleaded in extenuation that the governing body of the Orange association had no knowledge of the state of affairs. A matter so notorious could not have failed to come time and again within the searching cognisance of men whose care extends even to the marriages, votes, and other intimately private concerns even of their meanest members. In fact, some of the worst offenders on the bench were certain of the Enniskillens, Verners, Blackers, and other former members of the Irish Grand Lodge. In the course of previous chapters of this volume the reader has seen that Orangemen have repeatedly been expelled from the society for such enormities as "marrying a Papist," "voting against their Grand Master," favouring Catholic Emancipation, etc. But in all the private lodge and Grand Lodge documents which were brought into the light of day by the Parliamentary Select Committees of 1835 and the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857, there is not a single instance of an Orange magistrate or juror having been even mildly rebuked for that partiality in the administration of justice which must for ever remain a blot upon the 'scutcheon of the institution. On the contrary, we find instances of offending justices being lionised as heroes,[4] of criminals being pro-

[4] Among the justices who were dismissed from the Commission of the Peace, were Messrs. Greer, Blacker, Beers (the hero of Dolly's Brae), Lord Rossmore, and many others. Beers was fêted after the Dolly's Brae massacre; Col. Verner, after Constantine O'Neil had failed to get legal satisfaction against his two sons. Readers of the *Irish Times* and the *Daily Express* for December, 1883, and the two following months, and of the *Victorian Standard* of the time, will recollect the ferment created among the lodges by Lord Rossmore being deprived of the Commission of the Peace. He, too, was fêted and lionised by the Orange party. Lord Roden, another prominent Orange leader, was struck off the list of the magistrates of county Down in 1850. On this occasion he also was made the recipient of addresses, etc., by the brethren (Hansard, March 14, 1870, p. 1900). Captain Coote also became a hero of the lodges after his dismissal from the

tected and defended, and of the Government being hampered in its action by the society's leaders, when official efforts were put forth by the Executive, for very shame's sake, to straighten the ways of justice in the North. The Orange association has, in fact, proved itself a great Tammany ring. Some of its illegal activities have been already pointed out. Judged, as we may fairly judge it, by its actions and their naturally and presumably intended results, it is hardly unjust to conclude that, among the other objects referred to in previous chapters, it has likewise the two following life-aims in view:

1. To shield Orange misdemeanants and criminals from the legal consequences of their misdeeds.

2. To deprive Catholics, as far as lies in their power, of the legal protection and the judicial rights guaranteed them by the Emancipation Act of 1829, the passing of which, says the Presbyterian historian, Killen, drove them "almost to madness."[5] Such a course of action is, in effect, an attempt to revive, at least on a small scale, and as far as circumstances will permit, the good old days of the "glorious Constitution" of William III., under which five-sixths of the Irish nation were placed outside the protection of the law.

The evidence which favours these two conclusions exists in melancholy profusion down the whole course of Orange history: so much so, that one experiences a real difficulty in making a selection of instances in point.

IN THE FIRST REIGN OF TERROR.

Disregard of the elements of legal, and even of natural, justice, seems to have spread like a contagion to magistrates who came within the influence of the society even in the early stages of its career. In the course of the second chapter, reference has been made to the partiality shown to the Peep-o'-Day Boys, and to the cruelties illegally inflicted on Catholic suspects by Lord Carhampton and by magistrates whose sympathies lay with the first phase of the Orange movement. The fourth chapter describes the Reign of Terror with which the *lodge* era of the Orange society was inaugurated: the frequent murders, the wholesale intimidation, banishment, and plunder of the Catholic population of Armagh and the neighbouring counties. The Earl of Gosford, then Governor of

shrievalty of Monaghan, and his case was supported in Parliament by Orange M's.P. (Hansard, *ibid.*, pp. 1877, *sqq.*). The same is true of Lord Rossmore, who was deprived of the Commission of the Peace on November 24, 1884, for his conduct in connection with an Orange counter-demonstration at Rosslea. See Dublin *Daily Express* for December, 1883, and the following months.

[5] *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 463.

Armagh, after referring to the horrors of the Orange outrages on the Catholic inhabitants, said in his address to the assembled magistrates of the county: "The spirit of impartial justice, without which law is nothing better than an instrument of tyranny, has for a time disappeared in the country, and the supineness of the magistracy of Armagh is become a common topic of conversation in every corner of the kingdom."[6] In the Irish House of Commons, February 21, 1796, Grattan declared that "the inhabitants of Armagh have been actually put out of the protection of the law; the magistrates have been supine or partial; and the horrid banditti [the Orangemen] have met with complete success, and from the magistracy very little discouragement."[7] Lord Camden, the Viceroy, stated in January, 1796, that "acts of the greatest outrage and barbarity against their Catholic neighbours" were being then perpetrated by the Orangemen. "This," he continues, "has been owing to the magistrates in that county [Armagh] having imbibed the prejudices which belong to it."[8] The *Memoir of the Union* presented to the Government by Emmet, O'Connor, and McNevin, also refers to the encouragement which the Ulster magistrates, by their policy of masterly inactivity, gave to the rioters at this period. In his *Pieces of Irish History*, McNevin tells of the prosecutions instituted by the Executive of the United Irish Society "against some of the most notorious offenders, and some of the most guilty magistrates."[9] The prosecutions were unsuccessful. Their only apparent result was, says McNevin, "to redouble the outrages," and to leave the country more hopelessly than ever at the mercy of a merciless mob.

In debating the Insurrection Bill in the Irish Parliament, Sir Laurence Parsons said of the Orange magistrates of Armagh: "In that county it had been frequently proved on oath that several magistrates refused to take the examinations

---

[6] Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 431.

[7] Killen, *Eccles. Hist. Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 365. Plowden gives abundant evidence for Grattan's statement. *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 41-42, 48. According to Plowden, not a single magistrate of Armagh county was deprived of the Commission of the Peace, although many of them were believed to have encouraged the perpetration of those Orange outrages. Cf. Walpole, *Kingdom of Ireland*, chap. xv., pp. 456-457, and *note* 9, *infra*.

[8] Letter to Portland, January 22, 1796, quoted by Froude, *English in Ireland*, vol. iii., p. 178, *note*.

[9] Plowden gives instances of Mr. Ford and "several other magistrates" having disarmed their Catholic tenants, the arms thus secured being almost immediately placed in the hands of Orangemen "to be employed in the extermination of the disarmed owners." *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 25-26.

of the injured Catholics. By some of these magistrates they had been most cruelly persecuted; others would hear them only out of the window, and some actually turned them from the door with threats. If such men were to be entrusted with the power of transporting men at pleasure, what was to be expected but the most gross and flagrant violation of justice?"[10] Reference to the doings of Messrs. Verner, Ford, Greer, and other prominent Orange magistrates will supply abundant proof in point.[11] When, however, a number of the exterminators were proceeded against at the Armagh Spring Assizes in 1796, the witnesses for the prosecution, although escorted by dragoons, were intimidated, waylaid, maimed, or murdered. Only eleven of the "atrocious banditti" were sentenced. Of these one only—a Dissenter—was hanged. The remainder were liberated at the solicitation of friendly magistrates.[12]

The Quaker eye-witness, Mr. Christie, testified to the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 as to the murders and other grave crimes committed against Catholics in his district by the Orange party in 1795 and 1796. The Committee queried: "Did you ever hear of a man having been prosecuted or punished for those attacks upon the houses by wrecking and burning, and for the murders that were perpetrated?" Mr. Christie replied: "I do not, I think, recollect any instance of a person being prosecuted at that period for those offences, for no investigation took place; the magistrates were supine and inactive; they did not exert themselves in the manner that I, and that many others who wished the peace of the country, thought they should have acted." Referring to this early period of lodge violence, Lecky says: "It is impossible to resist the conclusion that some of the magistrates shamefully tolerated or connived at the outrages."[13]

The same spirit followed the spread of Orangeism to the South, where—as has been shown in the last chapter—lodge law speedily turned the civil law into an instrument of the worst tyranny. Early in 1798—before the outbreak of the rebellion—at the Queen's County Assizes, gentry and barristers wore in court the emblems of the society; and what Lecky terms[14] "Orange fanaticism" had already invaded the temples of justice in the South to such an extent as to call forth "an earnest remonstrance" to the Government from the pen of a

[10] Quoted by Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., pp. 41-42
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 25, *sqq.*
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 29.
[13] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iii., p. 446; cf. p. 437.
[14] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 240; cf. Judge Fletcher's words, *infra*.

paid informer, McNally,[15] regarding the shameful manner in which the lives of the unhappy Catholic prisoners were being gambled away.

A BUNDLE OF LETTERS.

In the course of the last chapter abundant reference was made to the illegal infliction of torture, death, etc., frequently without trial, by Orange or philo-Orange justices, and by yeomanry officers (many of whom were magistrates) during the wild times of the Inquisition of 1797-1799. Perhaps the most powerful indictment extant of the partisanship of Orange magistrates and jurors is contained in the correspondence addressed to the Government by Mr. Wilson, to whom brief reference has been made in the last chapter. Mr. Wilson was an English Protestant gentleman, a former Member of the British Parliament, and a relative of the Duke of Richmond. He had long resided in Tyrone county, of which he was a magistrate. His home lay close to the place where the first lodge was founded; where the Reign of Terror of 1795-1796 was inaugurated; where lived the Blackers, Verners, Atkinsons, and other Orange magistrates, whose freaks upon the bench afforded him exceptional opportunities for observation. His letters and narrative, published in 1807 and 1808, are crowded with facts and details of crying hardship. These have never been set aside, and form one of the blackest records of the judicial crime that stains the annals of Orange history. Mr. Wilson's opinion of Orange magistrates and jurors, formed after a personal experience of many years, is thus summed up in a letter written to the secretary of the Lord Lieutenant (Mr. Elliott) on the case of Constantine O'Neill: "It is with great concern that I feel warranted to declare that, where an Orangeman and a Roman Catholic are concerned, a most disgraceful partiality in favour of the former governs the proceedings of nine out of ten of the magistrates in the part of the kingdom I reside in."[16] In another portion of his correspondence he states: "That there was scarce an outrage, however flagitious, which could be committed in his [Wilson's] quarter of the kingdom against a Roman Catholic by an Orangeman that, by some means or other, did not generally pass unnoticed, but

---

[15] Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-240, 292. The Viceroy, Camden, admitted that in the assizes referred to, "the juries were almost too anxious to convict." A great number of death-sentences, said McNally, were passed, not so much from evidence, as for the purpose of "making examples" (pp. 238, 240).

[16] Quoted by "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 120. Some details about Wilson will be found in Plowden's *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 52, *note*.

always unpunished to the extent of its enormity; that, in matters of dispute between Roman Catholics and Orangemen, a most disgraceful partiality in favour of the latter governed the proceedings of nine in ten of the magistrates in his district; that the murderer, the forger, and the felon were, when Orangemen, protected and screened from justice by the Orange magistracy, and bills of indictment suppressed or smothered by Orange officials; and lastly, that the man who had hardihood sufficient to protect a Roman Catholic subjected himself not only to obloquy, but to personal danger."[17] Mr. Wilson applied to have his Commission extended to the neighbouring county of Armagh (on the border of which he lived), with a view to protecting the poor Catholics "who," as Mitchel says, "lived in daily and nightly terror under the shadow of *the original Orange lodge*, and in the neighbourhood which had been the scene of the 'Hell-or-Connaught' exterminations ten years earlier."[18] His application was refused. His well-meant efforts only brought upon him the vengeance of the Orange party. One solitary voice crying in the wilderness could not stem the "wanton oppression and official connivance which," says Mitchel, "made the North of Ireland itself a hell for the Catholic people during many a year since, and which is by no means over at this day."[19]

JUDGE FLETCHER SPEAKS.

In 1810—two years after the publication of Wilson's last pamphlet—Judge Fox, a Protestant, was on the North-West circuit. He found it necessary to severely reprimand the Orange, or mostly Orange, juries, for their display of sectarian animosity in court. About the same time Judge Johnson, when in Donegal, had the courage to pass a strong censure on the great supporter of the Orange party, Lord Abercorn, for a serious act of peculation committed by him against the Government and the ratepayers.[20] Four years later, in 1814, Judge Fletcher delivered his great charge to the Wexford jury. In the course of this remarkable pronouncement, while enumerat-

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

[18] *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. xii., p. 117.

[19] *Ibid.* Wilson was burned in effigy, with the sanction of Col. Verner; he was almost beaten to death by Orange processionists; his range of outbuildings, filled with hay, was burned in one night; and his importunities to the Chief Secretary and the Lord Chancellor for Ireland on behalf of his persecuted neighbours led to his being deprived of the Commission of the Peace by the anti-Catholic administration of the day. The hostility of the lodges finally compelled him to fly the country.

[20] For further particulars of Judges Fox and Johnson, and of the attacks made upon them by the Orange party, see preface by Mr. Clancy, M.P., to Judge Fletcher's *Charge*. Irish Press Agency, London, 1886.

ing the evils from which the country was at the time suffering, he says: "In the next place, the country has seen a magistracy over active in some instances, and quite supine in others. This circumstance has materially affected the administration of the laws in Ireland. In this respect I have found that those societies called Orange societies have produced most mischievous effects, and particularly in the North of Ireland. They poison the very fount of justice; and even some magistrates under their influence have in too many instances violated their duty and their oaths." Referring to the riotous behaviour of the Orange yeomanry at fairs and markets, Judge Fletcher continues: "Murders have been repeatedly perpetrated [by the armed yeomen] on such occasions, and though legal proceedings have ensued, yet, such have been the baneful consequences of these associations, that, under their influence petty juries have declined upon some occasions to do their duty. *These facts have fallen under my own view.* It was sufficient to say such a man displayed such a colour, to produce an utter disbelief in his testimony;[21] or, when another has stood with his hand at the bar, the display of his party badge has mitigated the murder into manslaughter." "'I am a loyal man,' says a witness; that is: 'Gentlemen of the petty jury, believe me, let me swear what I will.' When he swears he is a loyal man, he means: 'Gentlemen of the jury, forget your oaths, and acquit the Orangemen.'" Judge Fletcher comments strongly on the "highly indecorous, unfeeling, and unjust" conduct of magistrates, and "the grievous mischiefs" arising therefrom, and tells his hearers how he said to Lord Redesdale (then Lord Chancellor): "Reform the magistracy of Ireland, my lord. You have the power to do this; and until you do it, in vain will you expect tranquility or content in the country."

In the twenties a series of able pamphlets were brought out by the well-known publicist, W. J. Battersby, Winetavern Street, Dublin. One of them—the second—was addressed to the Orangemen of Ireland. It contains a list of some recent murders by Orangemen, which had been allowed to go "unrequitted and unrevenged," because "the sheriff, the jurors, the witnesses, were all Orangemen." "It is not alone," said the writer, "that the Catholics are liable to be murdered by Orangemen in their habitations; but even in courts of justice, as jurors, they are determined to show no justice to Catholics."[22]

[21] Mr. Kernan, a barrister of long experience in Ulster, deposed before the Parl. Select Committee of 1835 that Orange prisoners "frequently" wore the emblems of the society (ribbons, etc.) in the dock. Irish *Report*, vol. iii., Q. 7219.

[22] Quoted in "M.P.'s" *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 156.

On the 30th March, 1824, on the 4th of the following May, and on many other occasions the conduct of the Orange magistracy was brought under the notice of the House of Commons.

ON ITS TRIAL: 1835.

The most noteworthy witness that appeared before the Irish Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835 was undoubtedly Mr. James Christie. He was at the time sixty-two years old, and had watched the rise and progress of Orangeism ever since the times of the Peep-o'-Day Boys. In his examination before the Select Committee, he was asked:[23] "What is the effect of those Orange processions and lodges upon the minds of the Catholic people with regard to the administration of justice, both by magistrates and juries?" Mr. Christie replied: "Where an Orange magistrate is sitting on the bench, the Catholics consider that he is partial in his decisions. . . . I have said before, with respect to Orangemen being magistrates, *in my opinion it is not fit*; but when magistrates, men of respectability and intelligence, well-informed and impartial magistrates, cannot be got—*and I believe there are some parts of the country where they cannot be got*—I believe that a stipendiary magistrate, in such districts of the country, would be absolutely necessary."

Q. "For what reason do you believe they could not be got?" "Because there are so many completely Orangemen in principle, although not professed Orangemen; they are biassed in their opinion against Catholics, so that justice cannot be obtained at their hands." In reply to a following question, regarding *Orange* magistrates, he said: "I think they are unsuitable to try questions which originate in party feeling, when they themselves belong to a party, and encourage party feeling."

Q. "From whence do you derive your knowledge of the magistrates?" "From my observation of their conduct, and their *attending* [Orange] *processions* when the law was not against it; and from their language to the people at these processions; from the feelings of the Catholics when they are brought before them; and, knowing the circumstances of the case, a person of middling capacity can judge whether a magistrate is doing right or wrong." In answer to a further query, the witness deposed that his evidence regarding magistrates was derived "from observations I have made upon the conduct of the magistrates, what I have seen, heard, and known. I have sometimes attended the Quarter Sessions, and

[23] See *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Committee of 1835, Qq. 5693-5696, 5756.

I have seen Orange magistrates sitting, and I myself, and many others, were not satisfied with their decisions." Questioned as to whether he had personally witnessed acts of partiality, he replied in the affirmative. "I think," said he, "the principal thing was in the examination of witnesses; the credit that was given to one witness above another. Where two men *of equally good character* were brought forward to prove a thing, the one a Catholic, and the other a Protestant, the Protestant evidence was admitted as good, and the other was considered as doubtful." Replying to another question, he said that the "feelings of irritation that exist between parties in Ireland are rather between Catholics and Orangemen, than between Catholics and Protestants."

In his evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, Mr. W. Sharman Crawford, an Ulster Protestant Member of Parliament, justified the marked distrust which Catholics had in the administration of the law by Orange magistrates and Orange jurors.[24] The Right Hon. the Earl of Caledon (likewise a Protestant, and Lieutenant of Tyrone county) observed before the same Committee that the administration of justice would be very much improved if magistrates were free even from the *suspicion* of being members of any secret organisation.[25] Dr. Mullen gave instances of jury-packing.[26] Mr. John Gore, a Protestant, and stipendiary magistrate in Ulster, when examined by the Select Committee, described the Orangemen as violent opponents of the law in the North; blamed the Orange magistracy for thwarting the forces of the Crown in the discharge of their duty; and condemned their method of administering justice as leading to well-grounded suspicion of partiality. Mr. James Sinclair, another Ulster Protestant magistrate, after forty years' experience on the bench, deposed that the Orange justices were "a very bad part" of the population of the North.[27] From a long experience of the ways of the brethren, he thus describes their alleged readiness to assist in the maintenance of the law: "*I never knew the Orangemen of the North of Ireland, or any portion of them as Orangemen, assist in the preservation of the peace, or in the execution of the laws;* that is my opinion."[28] Mr. Kernan, a barrister of note, with over thirty years' experience of Ulster courts, testified that the Orange society had injured the

[24] *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish *Report*, Q. 4374.
[25] *Ibid.*, Qq. 5530, *sqq.*
[26] *Ibid.*, Qq. 6314, 6315, 6319, 6323, 6328.
[27] *Ibid.*, Q. 5182.
[28] *Ibid.*, Q. 5181.

administration of justice "very materially," and for the following reasons:[29]

"In the first place," said he, "the returning officer at the assizes and sessions, the high-sheriff generally, the sub-sheriff always, are both Orangemen, and I conceive that for the last thirty years, to the best of my recollection, there has been no jury (in Fermanagh at least) consisting of other persons than Orangemen. I think the administration of justice has been most materially injured in that respect; and the reason I think so is, because the verdicts were generally, in cases between Orangemen and Catholics, contrary to the judge's charges, as well as contrary to the evidence. That is my impression, and I can state several cases in proof of the fact."[30] The witness then mentioned several peculiarly flagrant cases of partisanship by Orange magistrates and jurors. We shall have occasion later on in the course of this chapter to refer to one or two of them. The following question, put to Mr. Kernan, and his answer thereto, refers to Orange jurors, and puts the whole situation in a nutshell: "What is your observation generally as to the administration of justice?" "*In all cases, civil and criminal, between Protestant and Catholic, justice is positively denied to the Catholic.*"[31]

The English Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835 thus sums up, in its official *Report*, its verdict on the tendency of the Orange association:

"The obvious tendency and effect of the Orange institution is to keep up an exclusive association in civil and military society, exciting one portion of the people against the other; to increase the rancour and animosity too often, unfortunately, existing between persons of different religious persuasions—to make the Protestant the enemy of the Catholic, and the Catholic the enemy of the Protestant; by processions on particular days, attended with insignia of the society, to excite to breaches of the peace and to bloodshed; to raise up other secret societies among the Catholics in their own defence, and

[29] *Ibid.*, Qq. 7213, *sqq.* (vol. iii). In a subsequent portion of his evidence, this witness shows that the exclusion of Catholics from the juries was deliberate and systematic. The extent to which the most barefaced jury-packing is carried on in Ireland to the present hour would seem incredible to anyone not acquainted with the system on which "justice" is administered in that country. See Mitchel, *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. xxii., pp. 193-194. One Crown Prosecutor, still living, acquired such a reputation for his systematic exclusion of Catholics from the juries, that he is popularly known in Ireland to this day by the *sobriquet* of "Peter the Packer." Cf. T. P. O'Connor's *Parnell Movement* (Ward and Downey's popular ed. 1887), pp. 8, 13, 14, 48.

[30] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 7214.

[31] *Ibid.*, Q. 7321 (p. 76).

for their own protection, against the insults of the Orangemen; *to intercept the course of justice;* and to interfere with the discipline of the army, thus rendering its services injurious, instead of useful, when required on occasions where Catholics and Protestants may be parties. All these evils have been proved by the evidence before the House in regard to Ireland, where the system has long existed on an extended scale, rendered still more prejudicial to the best interests of society by the patronage and protection of so many wealthy members, high in office and in rank, taking an active part in the proceedings of these lodges, though in Great Britain in a more limited way."

The *Edinburgh Review* (a Protestant magazine), of January, 1836, sums up the evidence laid before the Parliamentary Committee of the previous year, in seven charges or counts of indictment against the Orange society. The second, third, and fourth counts run as follow:

"That it [the Orange society] has fomented hostile and intolerant feelings between co-sects of the Christian religion."

"That by its annual processions and commemorations of epochs of party triumph, it has exasperated and transmitted ancient feuds, which have led to riots, with loss of property and life."

"That in consequence of the civil and religious antipathies thus engendered, the administration of justice in all its departments, whether of the bench, the jury, or the witness box, has become tainted or suspected."

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

The notorious partisanship of Orange magistrates and jurors was by no means ended by the exposure, disgrace, and practical downfall of the association in 1836. In Ireland it continues unchecked to the present time, and has formed the subject of condemnation in Parliament, and of vigorous protest by public bodies, by the press, by the judicial bench, and the bar. In the course of this chapter reference will be made to the efforts of an Irish Lord Chancellor to mitigate the scandals of the Orange bench and jury-box. During the debate on the Party Processions Act in 1870, Mr. McCarthy Downing, M.P., dwelt in strong terms on the "partial administration of the law" in Ulster, in cases to which Catholics and Orangemen were parties.[32] On the 17th of the same month reference had been made to the same subject by Baron Dowse, when Attorney-General for Ireland.[33] In his evidence before the Royal

[32] Hansard, March 30, 1870 (vol ii of Session), p 953.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 1909.

Commission of Inquiry into the Derry Riots of 1869, Dr. White, the leading medical practitioner of the North-West of Ireland, a gentleman who held the office of high-sheriff of the County of Derry, stated that he had several times declined to accept the Commission of the Peace for that city: he could not, he said, conscientiously take his place on the bench because of the strong bias displayed by the magistrates in party cases. During the course of what has been aptly termed "the kid-glove investigation" into the Derry riots of 1883, the Catholic body (almost three-fifths of the population of the city) issued a memorable document, from which I extract the following words: "It is notorious that the position of the Catholics of Derry is little better than what it was before Emancipation. We have neither the protection of the law from outrage, nor hope of redress after its commission. On the other hand, an insolent minority has controlling influence, not alone in civic representation, but even in the appointment and removal of resident magistrates and police officers."[34] The *Report* of the Belfast Riots Commission of 1886 contains a memorial presented to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland by the Catholic inhabitants of that chief centre of Orange activity. The memorial in question maintained that one of the causes of the Belfast riots was "a well-grounded conviction on the part of the Orangemen that law-breakers on their side would have comparative immunity from punishment when brought before the local justices."[35]

Herein lay one of the most hopeless features of the *régime* of the lodges in Ulster: the paucity of Catholic magistrates, and the fact that, at practically any time and place, a bench could be packed with men whose principles and practice were a sufficient guarantee that the law would not be impartially administered. We shall see instances of this as we proceed. An idea of the position of Catholics in courts of justice in Ulster may be formed from the following facts:

1. Till after the period of Emancipation there was in Ireland no Catholic judge. In Ulster there were scarcely any Catholic magistrates; and Catholics, though competent and entitled by law to serve upon juries, were commonly and systematically excluded from them. In large portions of the province, even in Catholic Fermanagh and Monaghan, Orange juries were the rule.[36]

[34] The memorial in question is given in full in Appendix A to the *Report* of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Derry sectarian riots of 1883. For the condition of Catholics in Derry and Belfast, see Appendix A, *infra*.

[35] Appendix E to *Report*.

[36] Mr. Kernan deposed before the Parl. Committee of 1835, that in an

2. "In 1833," says Lecky, "four years after Catholic Emancipation, there was not in Ireland a single Catholic judge or stipendiary magistrate."[37]

3. As recently as 1886, out of seventeen members of the Belfast Corporation who were magistrates, not one was a Catholic; and out of nineteen members of the Police Committee of the Corporation who were magistrates, not one was a Catholic.[38] A similar, if not worse, state of things, existed in Derry.

4. From the rise of Orangeism until 1814, the Orange yeomanry was practically the only police force in Ireland.

5. The Irish police were established in 1814. From that date until 1836 they were all Protestants. In that year Under-Secretary Thomas Drummond insisted on the introduction of a considerable number of Catholics into the force.[39] Long previous to this date, Orange lodges had been formed among the Irish police.[40] In Ulster the force was honeycombed with Orangeism. In Belfast, as late as 1857, out of 190 members of the city police, only six or seven were Catholics.[41] The spirit with which they discharged their duty as officers of the law may be estimated from the answer which one of them (Robert Blair) made to a question put to him by the Royal Commissioners who were sent to inquire into the great Belfast sectarian riots of 1857. The query regarded his sympathy with the Orange rioters: "You would not have the slightest sympathy for a brother Orangeman [rioter]?" "*Of course* I would, and I will not deny it."[42] Evidence of a

experience of Fermanagh courts, extending over nearly thirty years, he could recollect only one or two Catholics having been placed on juries there, either in the civil court or in the Crown court; and that during the same period practically all the juries were Orange. Catholics were competent, but were deliberately excluded by Orange sheriffs, sub-sheriffs, etc. *Minutes of Evidence, Third Irish Report*, Qq. 7218, 7252, 7255, 7257. See his evidence above. For jury-packing in Fermanagh, see Hansard for March 14, 1870, p. 1909. See *note* 29, *supra*.

[37] *Leaders of Public Opinion*, ed. 1871, p. 260.

[38] *Report* of Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast Riots of 1886, Appendix C. As a matter of fact there was not at the time a member of the Corporation belonging to the proscribed creed. In their *Report* (p. 14), the Commissioners recommend the appointment of more Catholic magistrates.

[39] *Memoir of Thomas Drummond*, by J. F. McLennan, pp. 266, 274. Edinburgh, 1867.

[40] *Third Report*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, p. 81.

[41] *Report* of Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Belfast riots of 1857, p. 4. Cf. *Reports* of Royal Commissions of 1864 and 1886, Appendices.

[42] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 7761. At that time the appointments to the city police were made by the Corporation Police Committee, not one of whom was a Catholic.

strongly-marked partiality for the Sandy-row rioters was, on cross-examination, dragged from a typically unsatisfactory Orange witness, a head-constable who was examined by the Belfast Royal Commission of 1886.[43]

In their *Report* (p. 4), the Belfast Royal Commissioners of 1857 show that many of the city police were Orangemen, and give what they term "startling evidence" of the partiality of the force for their brethren of the Sandy-row mob. A regulation has long been in existence, and is, I believe, strictly enforced, forbidding Irish policemen from joining the Orange association. Under-Secretary Drummond was, in his day, inflexible in upholding his regulation that there should be no Orangemen in the police force.[44] Such a course was, as we shall see, urged upon the House of Commons by the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835. It was pressed upon the notice of a Committee of Inquiry into the police force of Victoria in 1882. The matter seems, however, to have ended there; for, at the present time, according to the *Victorian Standard*, Orangeism seems to be firmly established among the police force of the colony. Reference to the lodge advertisements in the organ just mentioned—for instance, in its issue of November, 30, 1896—will show that members of the force in question act as Masters, Deputy Masters, etc., of lodges; while the colony has furnished the perhaps unique example of one policeman openly acting as marshal to an illegal Orange procession,[45] under the eyes of his superior officers, and of another who has time and again taken such a prominent part in the oratorical portion of Orange demonstrations, as to evoke a letter of protest in the columns of the public press.[46] It is needless to state that the increased spread of the society in this Department of the State could not fail to gradually but surely undermine the confidence of the Catholic body of Victoria in the administration of justice, in as far as it depends upon the conduct and evidence of such violent partisans as Orangemen are, and are required to be by the rules and traditions of the order.

---

[43] *Minutes of Evidence*, 13537, *sqq*. This witness's evidence was so unsatisfactory, and in some cases so contradictory, that the President of the Commission sternly reprimanded him: "You have given that portion of your evidence—I will not say whether the rest is true or not—in a most discreditable manner." Q. 13608.

[44] Barry O'Brien, *Thomas Drummond*, p. 242.

[45] The procession was held at Prahran, Melbourne, on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee. Arms (drawn swords) were borne in the procession, contrary to the Act. See *Argus*, *Age* and *Advocate* of date.

[46] *Portland Observer* (Victoria), July 26, 1894. A similar case of abuse of Catholics by a policeman occurred at Warrnambool some years ago.

THE MODUS OPERANDI.

It would be obviously impossible to detail the varied means which Orange magistrates and jurors have employed, during the past hundred years and more, to poison the founts of justice, and make law an instrument of tryanny. There were, however, three chief methods of work—some proper to magistrates, others to jurors—which were acted upon with such frequency and regularity that they may be fairly regarded as parts of a settled plan. These were:

1. Refusing to receive informations or to issue warrants against Orange misdemeanants and criminals; permitting them to abscond, and otherwise shielding them from arrest or molestation.

2. Acquitting Orange misdemeanants and criminals in the face of clear evidence of their guilt; against the directions of judges, etc.; in civil cases, giving verdicts or entering judgments in favour of the Orange parties to a suit, in the face of evidence, law, and equity.

3. Condemning Catholics to imprisonment and other forms of punishment, without trial, or without sufficient evidence of their guilt, or in the face of clear evidence of their innocence; in civil cases, giving adverse verdicts or judgments against the Catholic party, where evidence and law alike required a favourable judgment.

Abundant reference has already been made to the comparative impunity which accompanied the outrages of those embryo Orangemen, the Peep-o'-Day Boys, in sharp contrast with the savage and illegal punishments meted out to the Defenders; to the manner in which the Ulster magistrates connived at, sympathised with, or openly encouraged the excesses of the early lodges; to the tortures, burnings, murders, committed on the unhappy people from 1797 to 1799, not alone without protest from the magisterial body, but too frequently with their positive sanction and direction, and under the personal supervision of Crown officials, such as a former Earl of Enniskillen, John Claudius Beresford, and others who held the highest positions in the Orange association.[47] A few typical instances, selected out of a vast number on record, are here given of the methods by which the rills of justice were fouled in more tranquil times.

BY WAY OF ILLUSTRATION.

During the first ten years of the century, when Mr. Justice Fox was on the North-West circuit as Judge of Assize, he found some Catholic peasants in prison without any charge

[47] See chap. xiii., *supra*.

having been specified against them. One of the victims had been kept in solitary confinement by order of the great autocrat of the Irish lodges, the Earl of Enniskillen. At a later period the Attorney General, Mr. Blackburn, went in an official capacity to Enniskillen, examined the gaol, and found therein some eighteen or twenty Catholics who had been imprisoned for three weeks without any committal, or without any cause whatever having been assigned for their detention. One William Gabbett, an Orange magistrate, was responsible for this outrage on the liberty of the subject (Q. 7265, etc.) He was severely reprimanded by the Attorney-General, and the victims of his tyranny were immediately set at liberty. In the previous year this man Gabbett had signalised himself in the case of the King at the prosecution of McCuster *v.* Alexander Coulter and others, by discharging a party of Orange yeomen who had been legally and formally committed by two other magistrates on a charge of capital felony. In this case, as in the others, the aggrieved persons were Catholics. Commenting on Gabbett's action in the matter, the *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1836, says: "For this he would have been removed from the bench, but for his connection with the great Orange chieftain, Lord Enniskillen." The Orange yeomen were afterwards tried and acquitted by a jury of their brethren, the miscarriage of justice in this instance being so flagrant that the case was brought under the notice of the House of Commons.[48]

During the course of a riot at Derrygonnelly (Co. Fermanagh), a man named Murvanogue was killed by an Orange yeomen named Kitson. The father of the murdered man went from magistrate to magistrate, seeking for some one to take the necessary depositions for Kitson's arrest. All refused. The murderer was allowed to escape in a leisurely way to America. At the ensuing assizes, Judge Osborne administered a severe reprimand to all the magistrates who had so flagrantly failed in the discharge of their duty. In the meantime others of the rioters were tried by an Orange jury. All the Catholics were convicted; all the Orangemen acquitted. After some time the absconder, Kitson, returned home. He was tried, and in the face of the clearest evidence of his guilt, acquitted by a jury of his Orange brethren.[49]

The disregard of Orange jurymen for their oaths finds a further illustration in the case of the King at the prosecution

[48] *Report*, Parl. Select Committee of 1835, *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 7261 *sqq.*, 7387 *sqq.*, Cf. Introd. to Judge Fletcher's *Charge*, edited by Mr. Clancy, M P. Irish Press Agency, London, 1886. For an instance of the Earl of Enniskillen's method of administering justice, see chap. xiii., *supra*, pp. 297-298.

[49] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Committee of 1835, Qq. 7310., *sqq.*, p. 75.

of McCabe *v.* Robinson and others, which was tried by Chief Justice Bushe and an Orange jury at the Omagh assizes. Some five Orangemen were arraigned for the murder of a Catholic man named McCabe, son of the prosecutor. According to the evidence, the prisoners went from the lodge-room in Portadown—where the crime was stated to have been determined on—to the house of the deceased, and there and then, without the slightest provocation, deliberately took the life of young McCabe. The evidence was direct. The judge's charge was so strong in favour of a verdict of guilty that it amounted practically to a direction. The jury returned a verdict of not guilty. Mr. Kernan, a barrister who was present and took a full note of the trial, testified before the Select Committee that "it was the clearest case for conviction, and the Chief Justice was of the same opinion, who recommended me [for the sake of peace] not to publish it."[50]

In 1821, Lieutenant Hamilton deliberately halted a turbulent set of his "gallant Orange yeomanry" before the public house of a man named Kelly, at Dromore, and ordered them to fire into it. The order was promptly obeyed. The incident occurred on a fair-day, in the presence of great numbers of people. Several men were wounded, and one—Michael McBrian—killed, by the murderous volley. The *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1836, thus comments on the facts of the case, as given in the *Report* of the Irish Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835:

"Here is a deliberate murder, in broad daylight, in the presence of hundreds. The homicides scatheless, and roaming the country. The friends of the murdered man fleeing for justice to a noble lord [Lord Belmore], who tells them he will meet them *in a day or two*. . . . The principal offender, [Lieutenant Hamilton] charged with murder and an attempt to abscond, admitted to bail by two magistrates, *on mere verbal security*. The principal [Hamilton] absconding from this bail—the accessories to his crime [the yeomen] tried and found guilty of the minor offence of manslaughter, *on the plea of the superior guilt of the principal*. That principal returns [from America], and is not tried for felony, *but made a Justice of the Peace* in the very county in which the widow of Michael McBrian lives under the protection of the laws!"

The reader has already seen how, at Dolly's Brae, on July 12, 1849, a great body of Orange processionists burned eight houses, plundered or wrecked many others, including the school and the Catholic Church, wounded many people, and

[50] *Ibid.*, Qq. 7273, *sqq.*, 7282.

barbarously murdered several unoffending persons, one of them an old woman of seventy years. The deed was done in the glare of day, in the midst of hundreds of witnesses, under the eyes of several magistrates, some of whom had personally seized certain of the criminals red-handed in the act, and who had at their command seventy-five police, two companies of infantry, and two troops of cavalry. Those who are acquainted with the ways of Orange magistrates in Ulster will not be surprised to learn that not one of the processionists was arrested, or in any way interfered with. The gravity of the scandal at length led to a debate in the House of Commons, and moved the Government to interfere. The Crown Solicitor, Mr. Ruthven, attended at the Castlewellan Petty Sessions and tendered informations against six of the Orange heroes of Dolly's Brae. Mr. Berwick was present to advise the magistrates as to the law, which had been officially laid down on the point by the Attorney-General for Ireland. Five of the magistrates were willing to receive the sworn informations, and it seemed as if justice was at last about to take her first tardy step against the blood-stained criminals who had raged with bullet, fire, and bayonet on the heights of Magheramayo. But the bench was packed at Castlewellan. Lord Roden and other Orange justices, and their sympathisers—including two or three clergymen—outvoted the others, and refused to receive the sworn informations. Here an Orange bench raised a barrier over which shackled justice failed to vault. It mattered little in the end. Even had her course been smoothed at Castlewellan, it would have been barred a little farther on by the *chevaux-de-frise* of an Orange jury-box. The noble Lord and Grand Master Beers were deprived of the Commission of the Peace. Thus was the curtain rung down on another tragical Ulster court-house comedy, while the blood of the little boy Hugh King, of unarmed and unresisting Patrick King, of the harmless idiot John Sweeny, and of helpless, wrinkled, grey-haired Anne Traynor, still stained their rude coffins, and clotted on their shrouds, and called to man in vain for vengeance.[51]

It would be a weariness to the heart to tell the endless tales of Orange "justice" with which the history of Ulster abounds. To this day the law has never or quite inadequately, avenged the murders, burnings, or wreckings committed by

[51] See chap. xi., *supra*, pp. 222-225. A bench composed of the two Beers, of Lord Roden's agent, and two others committed some twenty of the Ribbon party for trial. The reader is referred to Mr. Berwick's official *Report*, and the other documents referring to Dolly's Brae, printed by an order of the House of Lords bearing date February 18, 1850.

Orangemen at Bailieborough,[52] Carrowkeel,[53] Banbridge,[54] Crossgar,[55] Tanderagee,[56] Maghery,[57] Derrymacash,[58] Annahagh,[59] and many other places. In the few instances in which the culprits were placed on their trial, the same party spirit was displayed which furnishes a highly practical incitement to crime, and makes the administration of justice in the Orange districts of Ulster, to this day, not so much a farce as a fearful tragedy.

The following travesty of justice will, perhaps, scarcely find a parallel in the whole history of the jury system. It is given here as an instance of the high capabilities of an Orange jury, It occurred in the case King *v.* Hall (an Orangeman), who was charged with having entered a Catholic church, and stolen therefrom vestments, etc. The case was tried at Enniskillen, by Judge Fletcher and an Orange jury. The prisoner (who "wore an Orange ribbon on his breast") *pleaded guilty*. The judge told the jury that they had nothing to try, as the prisoner's admission was, in point of law, sufficient to warrant his conviction. The jury *immediately* returned a verdict of "*not guilty*." Well as he knew the ways of Orange juries, Judge Fletcher was not prepared for this. "Thank God, gentlemen," said he, "that is your verdict, not mine. Gentlemen," he continued, "I will not treat you in this case as my highly esteemed departed friend, Judge Fox, treated a jury of this country; I will not placard your names on the session-house or grand jury room door; you shall not have an opportunity of dragging me before Parliament; but I will immediately order the sheriff to discharge you from doing any further duty at these assizes." The jury was accordingly discharged; so was the self-convicted thief. As soon as he reached the street "he was hoisted on the shoulders of Orangemen, and carried through the town of Enniskillen in triumph."[60]

SOME LATER INSTANCES.

The notorious manner in which members of the lodges have been not alone acquitted for taking part in illegal processions, but aided, encouraged and led therein by Orange

---

[52] See chap. xi., *supra*, p. 221.
[53] *Ibid.*
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Minutes of Evidence*, Parl. Committee of 1835, Qq 4313, etc.
[56] Pp. 221-222, *supra*.
[57] Pp. 42-43, *supra*.
[58] P. 225, *supra*.
[59] P. 222.
[60] Third *Report* of the Irish Parl Committee of 1835, *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq., 7216-7231.

magistrates, has been frequently brought under the notice of Parliament from 1813 to the present day.[61] In 1869, for instance, at the Monaghan assizes, a number of Catholics were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from twelve months to two years, for such offences. On the other hand, "seventeen Orangemen, against whom similar information had also been laid, were not prosecuted. . . . The information against the Orangemen was never acted upon. Party processions were still carried on in the North, because magistrates did not like to exert against their neighbours the powers given them under the Act. . . . There had been a partial administration of the law by the magistrates and by the Government."[62]

In the seventies, a number of Orange rioters were placed upon their trial before Lord Justice Barry at the Derry Assizes. The evidence pointed plainly to a conviction. The jury, however, was composed of "good men in bad times." They returned a verdict of "not guilty." "Gentlemen," said the Lord Justice, "that may be your verdict, but I venture to say you will not find twelve sane men who heard the evidence in this court to agree with you."[63] During the summer of 1886, Orange disturbances broke out on a large scale in the county of Tyrone. A Catholic policeman, named O'Neill, was subsequently brought up for trial before the county-court judge, Sir F. Brady, and a jury of "the right sort," charged with having assaulted one of the Orange rioters. The evidence was of such a nature that the Judge—Protestant and anti-Nationalist as he was—directed the acquittal of the accused. The jury, however, convicted him. Whereupon Sir F. Brady remarked: "I will accept that as the verdict of the jury. I will say no further. But I have not the slightest notion of punishing a man on such evidence. Gentlemen, you are discharged." In the same year, 1886, Lord Salisbury's Government took the Orange party under its wing, for the sake of the support[64]

[61] See chap. x., *supra*.

[62] Hansard, March 30, 1870, vol. ii. of Session, p. 953.

[63] Details of this and of the other cases mentioned in the course of this paragraph will be found in the files of the *Derry Journal*, the *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), and the *Belfast Examiner*.

[64] This support included the oft-repeated threat of armed rebellion. The usual "100,000 Orangemen" were to "line the ditches" north of the Boyne, and die fighting against the forces of the Crown. Similar empty threats were made, in much stronger language, in 1868 and 1869, during the Disestablishment agitation, and at frequent intervals during the Emancipation agitation in the twenties. Some Nationalist newspapers taunted the Orangemen of Ulster, in 1854 and 1857, with their frequent threats of rebellion, and called on them to prove their loyalty by sending, not 100,000 men, but a regiment, or even a batallion to the Crimea and to

which the lodges gave it on the then burning question of Home Rule.[65] It proved its friendship to the brethren by sending the Belfast rioters of 1886 to be tried by their *confrères*, the jurors of Tyrone. Not a single Orange juror was challenged by the Crown at those Omagh trials. The result was not calculated to increase the respect of the Irish people for the administration of justice in Ulster. One or two facts taken from the reports of the trials will give an insight into the ways of the Orange jury-box. Judge James Anthony Lawson, who tried the cases, was in religion a Protestant, in politics a violent anti-Nationalist. At the close of one of the cases he remarked of the jury that "it was shocking to find men influenced by prejudice, and paying such little attention to their oaths." On one of the days of the trials, three of the Orange party were placed in the dock on the charge of having wrecked a police-barrack. The accused set up an *alibi* as a defence. The jury disagreed. Next day the accused *pleaded guilty*, and the judge declared: "I considered the case against you yesterday was clearly proved. I look upon the evidence produced for your defence as entirely false." In another case two Orangemen were returned for the murder of a soldier of the West Surrey Regiment, and of a head-constable of constabulary. One of the prisoners was put upon his trial twice. The evidence on both occasions pointed unmistakably to his guilt. At the close of the first trial, Judge Lawson practically told the jurors that they had violated their oaths. "You are bound," said he, "to find a verdict [of guilty]. And *there is no question in the case, or doubt, at all.* You are bound to take the law from me. The fact has been proved before, and there is no alternative but the one." The jury still refused to convict. At the second trial, Judge Lawson addressed the jury in even plainer terms. "The juror," said he, "who would violate his oath under circumstances such as surround this case, is a man I look upon as *second in guilt only to the man whose case he has been investigating.*" Again the jury refused to convict, and to this day the foul murder of two faithful servants of the Queen, struck down in the exercise of their duty by the hands of assassins, remains unavenged. The *Derry Journal* of March 15, 1897, brings to hand another instance of the vagaries of a jury in the same court-house of Omagh which ten or eleven years previously had resounded to the stern denunciations of Judge Lawson. In this latter case, the jury acquitted a man who had been arraigned on a charge of a painful and shocking

India, to fight for the Crown. The Ulster Orangemen did not send so much as a corporal's secretary.

[65] See chap. xi., *supra.*

nature. Judge Murphy, in addressing them, said: "It was a great triumph to the success of the criminals, who, owing to the conduct of a jury, got free in a case such as that, where there was an honest seeking of justice by poor creatures who were grossly outraged. The outrage committed had been as clearly proved by the evidence as it was possible to have it proved, and, if the jury had paid the slightest attention to the evidence, they must have seen it as clearly as they could see the noonday sun." Continuing, the Judge said: "Go home, with the proud reflection of what you have achieved by the utter disregard of your oaths." Such conduct is a libel on the jury system. The condemnation of it is, unhappily, as well deserved in the Orange portions of Ulster to-day as it was when an Irish Attorney-General thus referred to the scandalous conduct of a packed jury who tried the Orange rioters of 1869: "It was," said he, "the greatest misfortune that could befall the administration of the law, that religious considerations should enter into the selection of juries."[66]

As already mentioned, the instances of the mal-administration of justice here recorded are merely given as illustrations of some of the methods of Orange magistrates and jurors. It would be quite beyond the scope of this work to include in it, even in a highly summarised form, the lengthy list of such illustrative "cases" now lying before the writer. The curious reader who may desire fuller information on this ungracious topic is referred to the following sources of information: The works of Plowden, Madden, Mitchel, Lecky, Barry O'Brien, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1797); Wilson's *Letters* and *Narrative*, and the many pamphlets published by King, Battersby, and others, from 1801 to 1830; various debates, motions, and questions in the House of Commons, in 1813, 1814, 1820 to 1825, 1832 to 1836, 1852, 1860, 1870, etc.; the correspondence of Camden, Cornwallis, Drummond, Lord Chancellor Brady, etc.; Shiel's *Speeches;* the *Reports* of the Royal Commissioners of 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886; the special *Reports* regarding the affairs of the Maghery, Annahagh, Dolly's Brae, etc.; the Irish newspaper press from 1795 to the present time, *passim;* and finally, that monumental and thorough-going condemnation of the whole Orange system, root and branch—the voluminous *Minutes of Evidence* and *Reports* of the Parliamentary Select Committees of 1835. In the course of this chapter a few extracts have been given from some of the authorities just referred to, testifying to the prostitution of the seat of justice, by Orangemen, to party and

[66] Hansard, March 14, 1870, p. 1885.

sectarian purposes. A few further extracts, out of many that might be given, will indicate one chief method which many thoughtful people believe would at least mitigate the worst features of that scandalous mockery of justice which, in the already quoted words of Mitchel, has "made the North of Ireland itself a hell for the Catholic people during many a year" since the days of Richard Wilson.

PRESCRIBING A REMEDY.

"Clearing the fountain," says Junius, "is the best and shortest way of purifying the stream." There have been many thoughtful men during the past hundred years who have felt that the tainted stream of Ulster "justice" could never be cleansed until one chief source of its foulness—the Orange magistracy—should be swept away. In a debate on the liberty of the press in the Irish House of Commons in 1798, Mr. Vandeleur (a Protestant) thus referred to the Armagh Orangemen: "He (Mr. Vandeleur) was astonished they should be countenanced and supported by Ministers, though the first law-officer of the Crown held their excesses, and the conduct of the magistrates who countenanced them, so much in hatred, that he declared, could they have found other men of sufficient loyalty in the country to fill their places, he would have removed everyone of them from the magistracy."[67]

The opinion held by Mr. Wilson, a Protestant magistrate of Ulster, as to the unfitness of Orangemen for the Commission of the Peace, is abundantly evidenced in his *Letters* and *Narrative*, which have been already drawn upon in the course of this chapter. In a letter to Lord Eldon, he stated that one of the crying needs of the time was "that the magistracy shall be placed in the hands of honourable, just, and independent gentlemen."[68]

In consequence of the continued confusion and uproar caused by the Ulster lodges in the early twenties, Mr. Hume, a Protestant M.P., called upon the Government to remove from the Commission of the Peace those magistrates who had encouraged Orange processions in Ireland.[69] In 1836, in consequence of the revelations elicited by the Parliamentary Committees of Inquiry, Mr. Hume and Mr. Finn moved in the House of Commons for the expulsion of all Orangemen from every department of the Civil Service. A Treasury minute, dated March 15, 1836, directed the dismissal of every

[67] Quoted by Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 62, *note*.

[68] Quoted by "M.P.," *History of Orangeism*, p. 124.

[69] *Parliamentary Debates*, March 30, 1824.

Civil Servant who, after the date of that order, would remain or become a member of the Orange society.[70]

Reference has already been made to the evidence given by the Quaker witness, Mr. Christie, before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, as to the unfitness of Orangemen for the Commission of the Peace. In reply to another question he expressed his opinion in still more sweeping terms. The Committee queried:[71] "What is your opinion of the effect of the Orange lodges upon the peace of society, and the good feeling of the people of the country?" "I think," replied the witness, "they have a tendency to keep up a bad feeling, and if anything could be devised to put them down, I think the country would be much quieter. It is not the poor people who go into the lodges [that do the most harm],[72] but the clergy and the magistrates, and the gentlemen of the country; and so far as Government can interfere, I think these are the people to lay their hands on. *I think no man should hold a Commission of the Peace, or any place of profit under the Crown, who is an Orangeman.*" A similar conclusion was reached by the English Parliamentary Select Committee on Orange lodges, as may be seen by the following extract from their *Report*: "Your Committee, anxiously desirous of seeing the United Kingdom and the Colonies of the Empire freed from *the baneful and unchristian influence of the Orange societies*, recommend the early attention of the House to that important subject, *with a view to the immediate removal from office of all public servants who shall continue, or become, members of any Orange lodge*, or of any other association bound together in a similar manner."

The warning voice of the British Parliament seems to have fallen on unheeding ears in at least one colony of the Australian group. In Victoria, Orangeism seems to have found its way into almost every Department of the Civil Service. Reference to the advertising columns of the *Victorian Standard* of November 30, 1896, and other dates, shows that the Police, Railways, Post Office, and Defence Departments furnish a quota of officers to the society, while some lodges, if not composed exclusively of public servants, are at least guided chiefly or altogether by them. The same lodge organ urges the still further extension of the association among State employés,

[70] The minute is quoted near the end of chapter xiv., *infra*.

[71] The whole of this part of Mr. Christie's evidence is well worth perusal. *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 5559, *sqq.*, 5689; cf. Q. 5677.

[72] In the previous question, the witness states that "the lower class of the society" are but the dupes of the "higher classes," who, for their own advantage, urge them on to breaches of the law, violence, etc., and thus do the greater harm. Cf. chap. vii., *supra*, p. 140.

while from the Orange press and platform comes the cry for the exclusion of Catholics from offices of emolument in the service of their country.[73] The reader may judge for himself if, and how far, such language was connected with the facts elicited by the Melbourne Post Office Inquiry Board regarding the case of James Sullivan.[74] For some unexplained reason, the incident has never, to this hour, been cleared up. As it stands, the whole circumstances surrounding it are highly calculated to produce a feeling of uneasiness among Catholics as regards the possible results of the spread of Orangeism in the public Departments of the colony.

AN ATTEMPTED REMEDY.

The Anglican Bishop of Ballarat, Dr. Thornton, spoke as follows at an Orange demonstration in that city in July, 1888. His words are noteworthy as coming from a sympathiser of the Orange association. "I should be sorry," said he, "to suppose that Victorian Orangeism had a word to say in defence of the disorder and violence which led to the suppression of the Irish lodge by Parliament in 1813, or the unreliability of Orangemen in courts of justice in Ireland, which made the Lord Chancellor for years refuse to make any Orangeman a magistrate."[75] He referred to the signal blow which was struck at the notorious partisanship of the Orange bench in 1857. Lord Carlisle was Viceroy; Mr. Maziere Brady, Lord Chancellor. English Orangeism had been blotted out by the great exposure of 1835-1836. The Irish society still clung desperately to life, and continued to be a power in the North, although deprived of much of its former physical strength of numbers, and shorn of all show of outward respectability. Its rules were remodelled in 1845. Four years later the brethren added a new chapter of blood to their history by the massacre of Dolly's Brae. For ten years from that date, every twelfth of July was marked with turbulence and outrage in the Orange centres of the North—culminating in the state of civil war which devastated Belfast in 1857. In the volcanic period of outrage which opened at Dolly's Brae, Orange magistrates, and, let it be added, Orange clergymen, played a prominent and by no means creditable part. These circumstances will explain the issue of the following order of the Lord Chancellor, which Orangemen of the present day would wish to see buried as deep

[73] See chapter viii., *supra*, pp. 162-163.

[74] See Preface to the first edition, *supra*.

[75] *Victorian Standard*, August 1888, p. 8, first col. The speaker continues thus: "But I wish I saw among your laws one which decreed the immediate expulsion of any members proved guilty of insulting acts towards opponents, or of boycotting in any shape or form."

as the chariots of King Pharaoh. The portion of the document which is here quoted was published in the *Northern Whig*, in October, 1857:

"To the Editor of the *Northern Whig*.

"Sir,—The enclosed extract from a letter which I have received from the Lord Chancellor, which I have his lordship's permission to make public, is of sufficient moment to warrant my asking you to give it a place in your columns.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"LONDONDERRY,

"Lieutenant, County Down.

"Newtownstewart, October 6, 1857."

The published extract from the Lord Chancellor's letter runs as follows:

"In reference, generally, to appointments to the Commission of the Peace for the County of Down and some other counties in the North of Ireland, I feel obliged, by recent events, to introduce conditions which seem to me imperatively called for, with the view to the maintenance of public tranquility.

"Your lordship is, no doubt, well aware of the success of turbulence and riotous outrage which have so long prevailed in the town of Belfast. Whatever party may have been to blame for the acts which more immediately led to these disgraceful tumults, *it is very manifest that they have sprung from party feeling, excited on the recurrence of certain anniversaries which for years have been made the occasion of irritating demonstrations*, too often attended by violations of the public peace, and dangerous, and sometimes fatal, party conflicts. *The Orange society is mainly instrumental in keeping up this excitement;* and, notwithstanding the proceedings respecting the association which are now matter of history,[76] and in consequence of which it was supposed that it would have been finally dissolved, it still appears to remain an extensively organised body, with but some changes of system and rules, under which it is alleged to be secure from a legal prosecution. However that may be, it is manifest that the existence of this society, and the conduct of many of those who belong to it, tend to keep up, through large districts of the North, a spirit of bitter and factious hostility among large classes of her Majesty's subjects, and to provoke violent animosity and aggression. *It is impossible to rightly regard any association such as this as one which ought to receive countenance from any in authority who are responsible for the preservation of the peace;* and however some individuals of rank and

[76] The Parliamentary Inquiry of 1835 on Orange lodges.

station, who hold her Majesty's commission,[77] may think they can reconcile the obligations of that office with the continuing in membership with the Orange society, it does appear to me that the interest of the public peace, at least in the North of Ireland, now requires that *no such encouragement should be given to this society by the appointment of any gentleman to the Commission who is, or intends to become, a member of it.*

"Intending the rule to be of general application, I think it right to ask from every gentleman the assurance that *he is not, nor will, while he owns the Commission of the Peace, become a member of the Orange society.* I think it right to inform your lordship that, in expressing the foregoing opinions and determination, I do so *with the entire concurrence of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.*"

But the order of Lord Chancellor Brady, the voice of Parliament and of public opinion, the protests of judges and barristers, even the suppression of the Orange society—(in Ireland in 1825, in England in 1836)—all failed to produce any appreciable effect on the record of judicial partiality perpetrated in the interests of the lodges. In the present instance Lord Chancellor Maziere Brady's order was allowed to remain without effect, because a weak Government preferred the interests of party to the claims of justice.[78] The

[77] The Lord Chancellor evidently refers to the Verners, Blackers, Enniskillens, and other Orange leaders who were officers of militia.

[78] A debate took place in the House of Lords, March 15, 1858, on the Orange society and the Irish magistracy, with respect to Lord Chancellor Brady's letter. The Earl of Derby, while admitting that the Lord Lieutenant had devoted much attention to the subject, and that there was no man "who would wish to hold the balance more evenly between parties in Ireland," nevertheless did not favour the "*absolute* disqualification" of Orangemen, on the ground that it "was a step beyond what the law *required*." Nevertheless, "looking upon the entire subject, he [the Earl of Derby] was of opinion that no matter what may have been the advantages of that [the Orange] society formerly, upon the whole the organisation of the Orange association was rather a misery than a benefit to Ireland." In the next sentence of his speech he added that "the [Orange] society was one whose existence they regretted." Lord Palmerston, when memorialised on the subject of the Lord Chancellor's letter February 18, 1859, strongly condemned the Orange association as being unfit "for the age in which we live." He declared that "the very foundation on which it rests casts a reflection on the institutions of the Empire," and exhorted the memorialists to "dissolve the association, and to put an end to an organisation which cannot answer any practical purpose." Nothing, he continued, "would more materially contribute to the peace of Ireland, and to the obliteration of ancient prejudices" than the dissolution of the society. The report of the Orange deputation to Lord Palmerston appeared in the London morning papers of February 19, 1858. An L.O.L. tract, entitled *Definition of Orangeism*, has the courage to say that "Lords Palmerston and Derby . . . declared the [Orange] society was not only legal, but eminently loyal."

Peel, Disraeli, Salisbury, and many other ministries furnish similar instances in point. Molesworth tells how, during the anti-Emancipation fury of the lodges, "the whole Liberal party" detested the conduct of the Orangemen; "nor were the feelings of Sir R. Peel and the wiser portion of the Conservative party more favourable to them. They could not but feel how much the Orangemen had done by their stupid bigotry to disappoint the hopes they had entertained of the beneficial results of Catholic Emancipation. They could not, however, venture to manifest the contempt and dislike they felt for men who formed the bulk of their supporters in Ireland, and were therefore obliged to wink at, and even to palliate, the bigotry of these mischievous marplots."[79] The outcry of the Orange party against Disestablishment was likewise a contributing cause to the last desperate stand made by the Disraeli ministry against that measure in May, 1868. "The Government," says a recent historian of the House of Commons, "knew well that they must be beaten; but they decided that they must have one more fight, lest the archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries of the Church, with the clergy, not to mention those singular defenders of the faith, the Orangemen in the North of Ireland, should say that her Majesty's ministers had given up the cause. Singular defenders of the faith!—garbed in orange scarfs, armed with bludgeons, and chanting, not psalms, but fierce political songs. O Religion! what strange things are done in thy name!"[80]

These repeated failures of ministries to deal with the disloyalty of the Orange society only serve to emphasise the difficulty of grappling with evils such as these, unless by the complete and effectual suppression of the secret organisations to which they owe their rise and continuance. Tammany Hall still places its votaries above the statutes. It puts its opponents, as far as it may, outside the protection of the law. But Tammany is founded on no stronger passion than that of self-interest, as represented by the dollar-piece. The founda-

[79] *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 379.

[80] *The Inner Life of the House of Commons*, by William White, vol. ii., p. 115. London: 1897. The Orange representatives have ever been notorious for their lack of ability, and are to this day known to members as "the deadheads of Ulster." An amusing instance of their low level of mental capacity was furnished, on the occasion referred to above, by Colonel Stuart Knox, M.P. for Dungannon, who caused a sensation in the House of Commons by a long quotation from a supposed speech by Mr. Gladstone, the leader of the Opposition, *against* Dis-establishment. Mr. Gladstone quietly pointed out that the speech attributed to him with such rhetorical vehemence had been really made by Mr. Whiteside. The House fairly collapsed in a fit of uproarious laughter at the expense of the gallant Colonel. *Ibid.*, pp. 111, *sqq.*

tions of Orangeism—the Irish Tammany—are laid broader and deeper. It is built on private interest *plus* the sedulously cultivated passions of racial, religious, and political hate, which, mainly through its agency, have for over a hundred years tainted almost every relation of public life in the Orange portions of Ulster. The British Parliament believed in the policy of laying the axe to the root when, in 1825, it suppressed the Irish Orange institution. A Select Parliamentary Committee of English gentlemen earnestly urged the extension of this policy to all the Orange lodges throughout the British dominions. With the evidence of its "baneful and unchristian influence" before them, they, in their *Report*, urgently called on the Government "to take measures for the complete suppression of such institutions," to "protect the country from all such associations," the extinction of which had become, in their minds, "imperatively necessary."

Chapter XV.

LOYALTY IN THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ORANGE INSTITUTION—THE GRAND LODGE, THE PARTY PROCESSIONS ACTS, AND THE COURTS OF JUSTICE—CORRUPTING THE LOYALTY OF THE ARMY—HOW THE ACT OF SUPPRESSION WORKED —THE CUMBERLAND CONSPIRACY.

Military officers set an example of bravery by going into action in front of their troops. Proof of their greater devotion to duty lies in the fact that, in proportion to their numbers, more officers than privates usually fall in battle. We naturally look for the highest expression of soldierly devotion to duty among the General Staff. Theirs is the tireless eye that takes its sleep in snatches, as did Buonaparte, Wellington, Moore, Moltke; theirs the sleepless brain that thinks and plans while the mere wisp of cannon-fodder, private Atkins, quietly dreams, with his feet towards the camp-fire. When, at a critical moment, the unsteady lines roll back before the storm of iron hail, it is frequently an officer of the General Staff who dashes to the point of danger, cheers up the failing ranks, and leads them again into the fray, as Steinmetz did at Spicheren, and Budritski at Le Bourget.

So much, in the matter of loyalty, should we—remembering their professions—expect from the General Staff of the Orange army: to wit, the officers of the Grand Lodge: that they should, when the occasion calls for it, rush promptly to the point where the weaker brethren show a disposition to retrograde from the path of duty, even were that path to lead in a few short paces to an honoured though untimely grave.

In estimating the loyalty of the Grand Lodge the following points must be borne in mind:

1. The position that obedience to law and attachment to the Throne are claimed to occupy in the Orange institution: namely, as one of its two fundamental principles. It is, perhaps, the only association of civilians that professedly makes the cultivation of loyalty its chief business, that habitually boasts of its unswerving loyalty, and sets itself up before the rest of men as a bright example of all that ideally loyal citizens should be.

2. The grand Lodge exercises complete control over the membership and policy of the lodges under its jurisdiction. It can at will not merely suspend or expel individual members, but it can close temporarily, or altogether suppress, any lodge, or any group of lodges, for any conduct which it may be pleased to deem inconsistent with "Orange principles." It is the supreme and irresponsible judge of what constitutes such inconsistency. From its decisions there is no appeal.[1]

Now, members and lodges may prove untrue to this alleged fundamental object of the institution (loyalty) in two ways: (*a*) negatively, by mere neglect or failure to "support and defend to the utmost of their power" the laws of the country; and (*b*) by positive disobedience to, or defiance of, the law or of constituted authority.

In the circumstances mentioned above (1 and 2) we should naturally expect that the Grand Lodge would visit with due punishment even the neglect—and much more the habitual neglect—of what we are told is one of the essential bases of the institution. As regards positive—and especially habitual—law-breaking by members or lodges, the penalty should be the severest in the power of the Grand Lodge to inflict, namely, expulsion of the guilty members, or suppression of the unfaithful lodges. We are all the more entitled to look for this when we reflect on the searching character of the control which it exercises over the purely private concerns of the members—on the prompt and unfailing expulsion of those who dare to select Papist wives, or to exercise the franchise as their judgment or conscience may direct: two faults (if they are faults) which, on the face of them, are not directly or violently subversive of the *alleged* aims of the Orange society, as set forth in the "basis of the institution."

THE GRAND LODGE AND THE LAW.

I pass over the mere negative fact of neglect to "support and defend" the law of the land. That point has been sufficiently dealt with in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters. Neither shall I deal with mere isolated acts of illegality which may or may not have come within the purview of the Grand Lodge. My sole concern here shall be with;

(*a*) Habitual and systematic violations of law and order;

(*b*) Which cover the whole or a great part of the course of Orange history;

(*c*) Which were brought prominently before the public through repeated Crown prosecutions; through the newspaper Press; through the *Reports* of the Parliamentary Committees

[1] See pp. 127 *sqq.*, *supra*.

of 1835 and 1852, and of the Royal Commissions of 1849, 1857, 1864, 1869, 1883, and 1886; through debates or questions in Parliament in 1813, 1814, 1815, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1832, 1835, 1850, 1857, 1858, 1860, 1864, 1869, 1870, 1872, 1883, 1886, etc.

The following are the chief phases of law-breaking referred to. They all come within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge:

1. Habitual and open defiance of orders, proclamations, and Acts of Parliament against party processions.

2. The well-known partiality of Orange magistrates and jurors, especially in cases to which Catholics and non-Catholics were parties.

3. Establishing and maintaining lodges in the army, in defiance of military regulations.

4. Administering oaths and tests, etc., in spite of their known illegality; defying the Act of Parliament which suppressed the Orange institution in 1825.

Now, if loyalty were to Orangemen all that it is asserted to be, the records of the Grand Lodge should, in the circumstances mentioned above, contain strong and frequent admonitions to law-breaking brethren and erring lodges; such admonitions to be followed either by

(*a*) A reformation in the conduct of the members or lodges implicated; or by

(*b*) Suspension, expulsion, or suppression, as provided by the rules for actions which are not in themselves either legal or moral delinquencies, and which must be, even on Orange principles, of far less moment than open defiance of rightful authority. Those who are guilty of this crime, according to St. Paul, "receive to themselves damnation."

Unfortunately for the claim of unfailing loyalty advanced on behalf of the Orange institution, all the records of the Grand Lodge are barren of either protest against, or punishment for, the public, serious, and notorious forms of illegality which I am about to consider in some detail. On the contrary, the Grand Lodge

(*a*) Knowingly allowed such illegalities to go on without protest or punishment;

(*b*) Positively encouraged certain forms of law-breaking perpetrated by lodges under its jurisdiction;

(*c*) Was itself guilty of long and systematic defiance of the law.

PARTY PROCESSIONS.

1. Writing of the early thirties, when the disloyalty and violence of the Orange society were rapidly hurrying it towards the ruinous official exposure of 1835, the noted Protestant

writer, Miss Harriet Martineau, says that from 1829, when the Catholic Emancipation Bill was passed, "the Orangemen seem to have lost their senses, as they certainly lost their loyalty."[2] During the next few years their processions in Ulster were characterised, as has been shown in a previous chapter, by a singular degree of terrorism, violence, and outrage. It was this wild outbreak of riot and confusion that led to the passing of the first Party Processions Act. The Bill was introduced in 1832 by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Stanley. He declared that it was directed against the Orange party, because they *alone* persevered in endeavouring to keep alive religious animosities in Ireland.[3] In introducing his Bill, Mr. Stanley made obedience to its provisions a test of Orange loyalty. He called upon Orangemen, if they were the loyalists they professed to be, to show it by their actions; to prove that they "were not the blind and bigoted partisans of an expiring faction, which would be loyal just as far as it suited their own interests or their own convenience." In the course of the tenth chapter of this volume the reader has already seen how the brethren responded to Mr. Stanley's challenge or appeal. They openly and violently flouted the Party Processions Act of 1832, as they had previously defied the proclamations of mayors, magistrates, and Lords Lieutenant, and as they subsequently defied the amended and more stringent Acts of 1850 and 1860. The action of the Irish Grand Lodge in the circumstances which thus arose enables us to accurately estimate the place which loyalty really occupies in the Orange organisation.

(*a*) Reference has already been made to the many apparently trifling matters—such as the conscientious exercise of sundry undoubted legal rights—which have been visited by prompt and unfailing expulsion from the Orange society. In all the records of the Grand Lodge, which have come to light, there is not a single instance in which any officer or member was expelled, or any lodge suspended, or in any way reproved or reprimanded, for riotous, disloyal, and armed defiance of proclamations and Acts of Parliament against party processions.

(*b*) On the contrary, the highest officials of the Orange institution either defended or approved of this open and seditious defiance of constituted authority.

Reference has already been made to the boast made by Deputy-Grand Master Colonel Blacker that the Anti-Proces-

[2] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii,, p. 268.
[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, vol. xiii., p. 1035.

sions Act of 1832 would only have the effect of producing three times as many Orange processions as had been held before, and to his threat of armed resistance in the event of any attempt on the part of the forces of the Crown to "maintain and support the laws" of the country. Quotations have also been given from the speeches of Viscount Crichton,[4] Lord Claude Hamilton,[5] and Deputy Grand Master William Johnston,[6] who either positively justified the defiance of the law by Orange processionists, or, at best, referred to their seditious, and too often sanguinary, demonstrations of physical force as being, at worst, only "a slight exuberance of loyalty." History sometimes repeats itself. The same excuse had long previously been offered in the Irish Parliament by the notorious Dr. Duigenan for the excesses of the Orange party in 1797 and 1798.[7]

The reader has already seen, in the course of a previous chapter, how those illegal processions were in nearly every case promoted or led by officers of the society, many of whom were also members of the Grand Lodge. He will recall the case of Deputy Grand Master Johnston, who in the face of proclamations to the contrary, marched through the country at the head of a large body of Orange processionists, who carried fire-arms and ammunition, "in case the worst came to the worst;" how he applauded the fraternity of Derry for having "refused, at the bidding of any man or any Government," to give up their offensive party displays;[8] and how Deputy-Grand Secretary Fairman, in his letter of 11th August, 1832, referring to the Act of that year, boasted that the Irish Orangemen were "determined to resist all attempts that shall be made by a Whig Ministry to interrupt their meetings or suspend their processions."[9]

The *Report* of the English Select Parliamentary Committee contains the following paragraphs, which were taken from the proceedings of the Imperial Grand Lodge (London), and were intended for circulation among the lodges of Great Britain and the colonies. The paragraphs in question were, says the *Report*, "copied [by the Imperial Grand Lodge] from the proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Ireland:"

"The Grand Lodge of Dublin thought proper to thank their Orange brethren for having assembled in large numbers

[4] Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. ccii., p. 1684.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 1690.
[6] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. of Session, p. 940.
[7] See p. 249, *supra*.
[8] See pp. 209-210.
[9] See chap. x., p. 208.

in one place, to the number of 75,000 Orangemen at Hillsborough, and the Loyal Orange Institution of England, in the same circumstances, calls the attention of their Orange brethren by republishing the resolutions of the Grand Lodge of Dublin, as follows:

"And, lastly, we [the Grand Committee] beg to call the attention of the Grand Lodge, and through them *return our heartfelt thanks and congratulations* to our brethren through the various parts of Ireland who, in the late meetings of 3,000 in Dublin, 5,400 at Bandon, 3,000 at Cavan, and 75,000 at Hillsborough, by their strength and numbers, the rank, respectability, and orderly conduct of their attendance, the manly and eloquent expressions of every Christian and loyal sentiment, vindicated so nobly the character of our institution against the aspersions thrown on it as 'the paltry remnant of an expiring faction.' *And we ardently hope that our brethren in the other parts of the kingdom* who have not as yet come forward will do so, and not forget the hint given to us in our Sovereign's last most gracious declaration, 'to speak out.'"[10]

In this resolution the Irish Grand Lodge sets the seal of its formal approval on past acts of illegality, and invites to a repetition of this form of law-breaking in the immediate future. It canonises defiance of the law by making it a subject of "heartfelt thanks and congratulations."

ADMINISTERING THE LAW.

2. *Orange Magistrates and Jurors:* The reader has seen in the course of the last chapter how the conduct of Orange magistrates and Orange jurors, in cases in which Catholics are concerned, has been, from the very foundation of the society, a grave blot upon the administration of the law in Ulster. It has, moreover, been shown that these facts were so frequently brought under public notice that they could not have escaped the attention of the Irish Grand Lodge, least of all when we consider that some of the chief offenders in this respect were those whose names have been traditionally associated with the leadership of the Irish organisation.

Now, the Grand Lodge is guardian and supreme arbiter of both the membership and policy of the institution. Assuming its professions to be sincere, its first duty was to institute a strict inquiry into the frequent, serious, and authoritative allegations of disloyal conduct which were made from the

[10] This resolution forms part of the proceedings of the Irish Grand Lodge for November 12, 1834, while the Party Processions Act of 1832 was still in full force. The meetings referred to above were formed and fed by processions of the brethren. For resolution, see App. First *Report*, p. 77.

newspaper press, the judicial bench, and in Parliament—allegations which point to nothing less than a widespread determination on the part of Orange magistrates and jurors to defeat the ends of justice. The next step of the Grand Lodge should have been either to compel the guilty brethren to respect the law of the land and the elementary principles of justice, or, failing this, to promptly rid so eminently loyal a society of such disloyal company. This uncompromising attitude towards illegality would be rendered all the more necessary by the fact that the recalcitrant magistrates and jurymen, on account of their social position or official status, would, if permitted to remain in the society, help to contaminate by their bad example the all-needful loyalty of the more humble rank and file of the brethren, and thus frustrate one of the chief aims for which (we are told) the Orange society was instituted.

It is, however, a significant fact that, in all the long records of the Grand Lodge that have been dragged into the light of day, there is not a hint of an inquiry having ever been held into the statements made, officially and otherwise, reflecting on the conduct of Orange magistrates and jurors in cases in which Catholics were concerned. There is not a solitary instance of an Orange magistrate or juryman having been expelled, suspended, fined, or even reprimanded, for unloyal disregard of the sanctity of his oath. The Grand Lodge records bear no evidence that any effort was ever made, by inquiry, circular, resolution, penalty, or otherwise, to cope with the grave public scandal with which the name of the Orange society has been associated for over a hundred years. The serious form of law-breaking referred to here has apparently no place among the crimes that are recognised as punishable in the lodges. The elementary citizen duty of "obedience to the law" is plainly a matter of small moment in the eyes of the Grand Lodge compared with the stern primary need of preventing members "marrying Papists," and of holding in a firm grip the ever-ready and obedient voting power of the lodges.

Another suggestive item in the policy of the Grand Lodge is its habit of supporting Orange criminals and misdemeanants against the officers of the law. Several instances of this are recorded in the *Report* of the English Select Committee of 1835. The lodges, says the *Report* referred to, "have interfered in the course of justice by subscriptions to defend and protect parties of Orangemen, and to prosecute the magistrates for interfering with them, as in the case of Liverpool in 1819, when the Mayor of Liverpool interrupted the Orange procession on the 12th of July in that year." A number of lodges contributed subscriptions for this purpose. The Grand Lodge

of England also entered cordially into the project, as may be seen from the following entry in the English Parliamentary Committee's *Report:*

"Committee meeting, 13th October, 1819, Manchester—Thanks to Lord Kenyon[11] for his subscription towards the prosecution in Liverpool, and to the lodges who have subscribed and transmitted their subscriptions for the same purpose." In 1832, the records of Armagh, Cavan, Monaghan, and other counties in Ulster were stained by many of the crimes which led to the passing of Stanley's Party Processions Act of that year. For their share in those outrages, a number of Orangemen were prosecuted in Cavan. Under date February 29th, the Irish Grand Lodge voted a sum of £20 for "the defence of our brethren about to be prosecuted at the ensuing Cavan Assizes, in the case of King *v.* Beckett, Souddon, and others."[12] On two subsequent dates further amounts of £59 17s. 9d., and £47 5s.—making altogether £127 2s. 9d.—were voted for the same purpose. In 1833 (according to the Irish Parliamentary *Report*) the grant of a large sum of money was passed by the Irish Grand Lodge for the defence of one of the brethren named Beith, who was placed on his trial at the Dundalk Assizes, for having murdered a Catholic by stabbing him with an oyster-knife.[13] We have no evidence that the Grand Lodge of Victoria ever disapproved of the action of the brethren of L.O.L., No. 9 (Melbourne), or disallowed the subscription of £2 2s. which they voted towards the expenses of a Tasmanian newspaper, the Launceston *Daily Telegraph*, the proprietors of which had been compelled to pay £150 damages for libel on an Irish Catholic priest.[14]

CORRUPTING THE ARMY.

In a passage of his *Memoirs*, already quoted, the noted apologist of the lodges, Musgrave, frankly admitted that the Orange society "should not be admitted in our regular army or militia . . . as it would be likely to create party zeal and discord."[15] The incompatibility of its principles and conduct with the loyalty and discipline of the troops was recognised at an early date by British officers. The Earl of Hardwicke,

---

[11] Lord Kenyon was Deputy Grand Master for England and Wales, and, after the Duke of Cumberland, the leading light of the Imperial Grand Lodge, the meetings of which were usually held at his London house.

[12] Appendix to Irish Parliamentary Committee's *Report*.

[13] Through the help of a friendly jury, the prisoner was acquitted of the charge of murder, and found guilty of manslaughter only.

[14] *Victorian Standard* for August, 1891, reports the subscription referred to. See p. 159, *supra*.

[15] *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions*, vol. i., p. 74, ed. 1801.

who commanded the Cambridgeshire militia at Dublin in 1799, issued a regimental order on the 17th of April of that year, "strictly forbidding" membership of "any such lodges or societies."[16] In 1810 Major-General Cockburne, an Irish Protestant officer, issued general orders to his troops (the 11th Infantry, then stationed at Chelmsford, in Essex) forbidding the display of Orange colours, and declaring that such party divisions were inconsistent with their duty to their King and country.[17] These were particular orders, applying to particular regiments. On the 1st of July, 1822, and again on 14th November, 1829, General Orders were issued by the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces, addressed to commanding officers of regiments and depôts, and to general officers, etc., at home and abroad, strongly reprobating the holding of Orange lodges in any regiments as "*fraught with injury to the discipline of the army*;" "*that, on military grounds, the holding of Orange lodges in any regiment or corps is contrary to order and the rules of the service*;" and "that a disregard of this caution will subject offending parties to trial and punishment for disobedience to orders." In their *Report* the English Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835 on Orange lodges showed, on the evidence of Major-General Sir J. MacDonald, Adjutant-General of the army, "that the confidential circular of July, 1822, was embodied in the edition, printed in that year, of the *General Regulations and Orders* of the Army; that it was the duty (27) of the colonel or commander of every regiment to have one of these books; that every regimental officer (31) was directed to supply himself with a copy of it; and that every regimental orderly room was required to have a copy (31). Of the orders of the Duke of York," Sir J. MacDonald adds, "no officer ought to be ignorant." So runs the official *Report*.

Now—not to mention others—the Imperial Grand Master, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, was a field-marshal. Fairman, the Deputy Grand Secretary, was a lieutenant-colonel. The Enniskillens, Verners, Blackers, and other grandees of the Irish Grand Lodge, were officers of militia. The question of the criminal knowledge of the members of the Imperial Grand Lodge (London) is thus disposed of by the *Report* which the English Select Committee of 1835 sent to the House of Commons:

"Your Committee have selected some letters received from the non-commissioned officers and privates in the army, and also the answers to them, which will satisfy the House that

[16] Quoted by Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., introd., p. 117.
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 125-126.

the grand officers of the Loyal Orange Institution have given assistance and encouragement to keep up and to establish lodges in the army, *although these officers were made acquainted with the orders of the Commander-in-Chief forbidding the attending or holding them in regiments, and notwithstanding they were informed that some commanding officers had actually suppressed the lodges in conformity with the General Orders.*"

Now, if its professions of loyalty were sincere, the Grand Lodge would have taken steps to prevent the formation of Orange lodges in the army, and to withdraw the warrants of, and suppress, such lodges as may have been surreptitiously established among the troops. It is a singular comment on its professions that, so far from doing so, this supreme council of the society, and its chief officers, did all in their power to interfere with the discipline of the army, and to corrupt its loyalty, by dividing its allegiance between the King and country on the one side, and the political aims of the Grand Lodge leaders on the other. In spite of the known illegality of their action, they deliberately and, as the lawyers say, with malice prepense:

(*a*) Actively pushed the formation of Orange lodges in the army;

(*b*) Positively encouraged disobedience to orders in the army, and resisted all attempts to suppress the lodges formed by them in defiance of military regulations.

The facts here stated in connection with the spread of Orangeism in the army are, except where otherwise stated, taken exclusively from the *Report* of the Select Parliamentary Committee (English) of 1835. This Committee, in their *Report*, give a list of thirty-two "military warrants issued to the following regiments to hold lodges under the Loyal Orange Institution, and which was extracted from the printed register of 1830, presented by Mr. Chetwoode [the English Deputy Grand Secretary]; and if the regiments and military corps holding warrants under the Grand Lodge of Dublin, as stated in the evidence before the House, are taken into account, it will be seen how large a portion of the army has been at different times imbued with Orangeism." [Here follows a detailed list of the thirty-two military warrants issued by the English Grand Lodge, in defiance of military regulations].

On the 10th of August, 1832, Mr. Nucella was sent as the accredited agent of the Imperial Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland, and the English Grand Lodge, to the British regiments stationed in Malta and the Ionian Islands. He issued sundry new warrants for the formation of fresh lodges (details of which appear in the *Report*). He was forbidden by

the Civil Governor of Corfu (Lord Nugent), and by the commanding officer of the 42nd Regiment at Malta, to establish lodges among the troops under their control; but (says the *Report* of the Parliamentary Committee) "he *afterwards* attended the meetings of other military lodges there, *although he knew they were being held contrary to the order of the Commander of the Forces.*" All this time, the *Report* continues, "Mr. Nucella was recognised openly by them [the officers and men] as a commissioner from the Duke of Cumberland, the Imperial Grand Master of the Loyal Orange association of England." *He was in constant communication with the Grand Lodge, furnished full details of his work*, and (say the Committee) "in every letter, and in his evidence, seems proud of that duty. His warrant [signed by the Duke of Cumberland] was hung up openly in his chambers all the time he was in Malta." The *Report* states that his letters "were read by the Grand Committee—*were read in the Grand Lodge*—when the Duke of Cumberland and Lord Kenyon were present, and *the thanks of the Grand Lodge* were given to Mr. Nucella for his zeal." The following entry was copied by the Select Committee from the books of the Grand Lodge:

"The zealous exertions of Brother Nucella, M.D.C., and Grand Commissioner on the Continent for the advancement of the institution, as detailed in his letters from Italy, Malta, and the Ionian Islands, afforded high gratification, and called forth the unanimous approbation of the Grand Lodge." This was followed by a letter dated 6th June, 1834, conveying the warm thanks of the Grand Lodge and of "our illustrious Grand Master," and signed by Deputy Grand Secretary Fairman. The same *Report* shows how Fairman followed the same seditious course of action in Great Britain as Nucella had done at Malta and in the Ionian Islands.

Referring to Canada, the English Committee of 1835 report to Parliament that "considerable correspondence has passed between the soldiers and non-commissioned officers of the army there and the Deputy Grand Secretary of the Loyal Orange Institution in England; and *strong encouragement appears to have been given at one time by the Imperial Grand Lodge in London to the establishment of new lodges*, and to the extension of Orangeism amongst the troops in those provinces."[18] Not the least

[18] Ogle Robert Gowan was sent as the emissary of the Grand Lodge, to corrupt the fidelity of the army in Canada. He was at the same time Grand Master of Canada. The Irish Grand Lodge objected to Gowan's appointment, partly on account of his degraded moral character, documentary evidence of which they submitted to the Imperial Grand Lodge (London). The other ground of their objection against Gowan's appoint-

interesting portion of the Parliamentary *Report* is devoted to the spread of the society among the British troops stationed in New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land. Referring to several letters which had reached the Grand Lodge from the two colonies just mentioned, the *Report* goes on to say:

"Your Committee consider it of importance to place prominently before the House one letter, dated January, 1833, in which it appears that *the then Deputy Grand Secretary of the institution in London induced the writer, a soldier, to disobey the orders of his commanding officer*, and did actually exchange an Irish for an English warrant to hold a lodge in the regiment, contrary to the orders of the Commander-in-Chief, *and at the time he knew that the military orders were in force against such grant.*" The letter is signed, "Wm. M'Kie, Corporal, 17th Regiment," and is dated, "Sidney, 13th January, 1836." It contains the following evidence of Orange loyalty, as the word was understood in the Imperial Grand Lodge:

"I was ordered," said the loyal corporal, "previous to embarkation, if I had or held a warrant of the Orange system, to send it back to the Grand Lodge, *which I did not think proper to do. This, I must own, was direct disobedience of orders to my commanding officer; but I wrote to Mr. Chetwood Eustace, then Deputy-Grand Secretary, and he informed me not to be the least afraid, for no harm would be done me. I knew there was an order issued in 1829 prohibiting Orange lodges in the army.*"

PREVARICATION IN HIGH PLACES.

The position of the Imperial Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland, on the formation of lodges in the army, is so redolent of Orange methods of action that it deserves more than passing notice. In the course of the proceedings of the Select Committees, scrap after scrap of evidence reached the public showing the serious and menacing nature of the widespread conspiracy which had been silently undermining the loyalty of the British army. The public alarm was all the more accentuated by the general and well grounded belief (which found expression both in and out of Parliament) that the Orange leaders were engaged in a huge armed conspiracy to set aside the claims of the Princess Victoria to the British Throne, and to set up in her stead the Imperial Grand Master of the Orange society, the Duke of Cumberland. "The Next to the Throne," as the brethren termed him, saw the storm breaking which wrecked his hopes of the succession, temporarily suppressed the Orange society, and exposed him to the

ment was, their own jurisdiction over Canada. Gowan's services were, however, retained.

danger of impeachment for treason. He consulted for his personal safety in a manner thoroughly in keeping with his character as it is known in history. (*a*) On the 5th August, 1835, he addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee, in which he declares that "*he knows of no Orange lodge in any regiment.*" (*b*) On the 24th of the same month, he wrote that "through the negligence or indiscretion of the officers of the Orange institution, many grants of warrants or renewals of former grants have, *without the knowledge of his Royal Highness, and contrary to his declared intention*, been issued from time to time, in contravention of the order of the late illustrious Commander-in-Chief, his Royal Highness the Duke of York."

To the first of the Duke's statements the Select Committee reply with a touch of quiet irony: "It is satisfactory to know that one result of the inquiry by the Committee has been to bring to his knowledge, and to convince his Royal Highness, that Orange lodges *did, and do*, exist in many regiments of the army; and that he has presided, as Imperial Grand Master, over an institution which has for many years been acting in contravention of the orders of commanding officers of corps, and of the Commander of the Forces. Your Committee submit that *it would have been very easy for his Royal Highness to have published the document by which, and the time and place where, he issued any order, or made any declaration against Orange lodges in the army*, instead of a general disclaimer." It is needless to say that the Committee's challenge was never accepted by the Imperial Grand Master. Briefly put, the Select Parliamentary Committee of English gentlemen declined to believe the statement of the Imperial autocrat of the Orange lodges. They also point out that the facts elicited during the enquiry prove that the Duke not alone knew of the existence of lodges in the army, but that the disloyal movement had *his full sanction and approval.*

Reference has already been made to the mission on which Brother Nucella was sent, *under the Duke's warrant*, to the British troops stationed at Malta and in the Ionian Islands. The English Committee's *Report* quotes from the minutes of the London Grand Lodge the following instances in which *the Imperial Grand Master presided at meetings which transacted business in connection with military lodges:*

Meeting of March 17, 1829, the Duke of Cumberland, Grand Master, in the chair: Five new warrants (specified in the *Report*) were granted for the formation of lodges in the army.

On February 17, 1831, the Duke of Cumberland presided

at a Grand Lodge meeting at which three warrants (specified in the *Report)* were issued for holding lodges in the army.

The Duke presided at another meeting on June 4, 1832, at which five letters (also specified in the *Report)* were received from non-commissioned officers and privates in army lodges at Bermuda, Corfu, Dublin, Malta, and Quebec.

The Imperial Grand Master again presided at a Grand Lodge meeting on April 16, 1833, when the proceedings of a Woolwich army lodge (No. 233) were considered. An Orange artilleryman belonging to the lodge was examined, and a private belonging to it suspended from membership.

There were likewise before his eyes the letters of his Grand Commissioner, Nucella, *some of which had been read in his presence;* the entries of dues received from military lodges; the printed lists of army lodges; the rule regarding the remission of fees to soldiers and sailors, which (with other "laws and ordinances of the institution") *was approved by his Royal Highness*, as appeared from the printed report of the proceedings of June 4, 1834. He likewise presided over the meeting which passed a vote of thanks to Mr. Nucella for his zeal in spreading Orangeism among the British troops at Malta and the Ionian Islands. Many other details are added in the *Report* of the English Committee, which plainly show that the Imperial Grand Master and his fellow-officers of the London Grand Lodge knowingly and deliberately tampered with the loyalty of the British army. In her *Thirty Years' Peace*, Miss Martineau points out how neither Lord John Russell nor the House of Commons was satisfied with the Duke's disavowal of guilty knowledge in the matter.[19] The English Committee, after detailing the facts bearing upon the denials of the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Kenyon,[20] and other officers of the Imperial Grand Lodge, frankly say in their *Report:*

---

[19] Vol. ii., p. 276.

[20] Lord Kenyon, in his evidence before the English Select Committee, at first denied all knowledge of the existence of lodges in the army. He then admitted that Rule 47 (1821) *referring to the regulation of regimental lodges*, had been *inserted with his sanction* (Q. 2736). A few questions further on (Q. 2742) he admits his acquaintance with Rule 47, just referred to, but "*knowing that lodges in the army were forbidden*, it occurred to his mind that no lodges at the time did exist in regiments, and *consequently that they could not exist afterwards*." But the rules were year after year revised and sanctioned by Lord Kenyon up to 1834. These, one and all, included provisions regarding regimental lodges, the latter rules containing privileges dispensing soldiers from paying the regular fees, etc. Lord Kenyon was also present at many meetings (some held in his house) when warrants were issued to, and correspondence received from, army lodges. The climax of Lord Kenyon's examination *on oath* was reached when a letter was put into his hands, *addressed to and endorsed by him, and coming from the*

"Your Committee, in reviewing all the facts brought before them, and taking into consideration the mode in which they have been proved, *are unable to reconcile these facts with the ignorance* of these proceedings on the part of Lord Kenyon and by His Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland."

The "qualifications of an Orangeman" require that a brother should not alone be distinguished for his exceptional loyalty, but that he likewise "should cultivate *truth* and justice," etc. Here we have the Imperial Grand Lodge, both as a whole and in its chief members, publicly convicted by a Parliamentary Committee of English gentlemen, of having made upon oath, in the interests of Orangeism, statements which were notoriously at variance with fact, and of having, in defiance of well-known military regulations, systematically, deliberately, and on a large scale, tampered with the discipline of the army —the nation's sole dependence in the day of foreign war and of domestic strife.

The English Committee's *Report* likewise lays to the charge of the Orange society "those evils which disturb both civil and military life so much, and which threaten the most serious consequences to the community of the United Kingdom, if allowed to continue." "The obvious tendency and effect of the Orange institution," it continues, in a passage which has been already quoted at length, "is to keep up an exclusive association in civil and military society, exciting one portion of the people against the other . . . . to interfere with the discipline of the army, thus rendering its services injurious instead of useful, when required on occasions where Protestants and Catholics may be parties."

A CRY FOR SUPPRESSION.

At that time, according to the *Report* of the English Committee, "the number of Orangemen in Ireland is 220,000, as stated by the Deputy Grand Secretary for that country, *and these chiefly with arms in their possession;* and if the Orangemen in Great Britain and the colonies amount only to half that number, the House will judge *how dangerous such an association, bound together by religious ceremony and sanction almost equal to that of an oath, might become under possible circumstances of the country.*

---

correspondent of a regimental lodge at Dover, enclosing a remittance! This is referred to in the English Committee's *Report*. Further details of Cumberland's and Kenyon's prevarication will be found in Miss Martineau's *Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., pp. 273-274. In his examination before the Belfast Royal Commission of 1857, Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen professed total ignorance of the existence of secret signs, etc., in the Orange society. See p. 110, *supra*.

A great political body thus organised in the ranks of the army, and in every part of the British Empire, *is a formidable power at any time, and under any circumstances; but when your Committee look to the political tendency and measures of the Orange societies in England and in Ireland, and particularly to the language contained in addresses to the public, and in the correspondence with the grand officers of the institution, and consider the possible use that might be made of such an organised power, its suppression becomes, in their opinion, imperatively necessary.*"

Elsewhere in the same *Report* we find the following:

"*When every endeavour on the part of Government to put an end to Orange lodges in the army has been met by redoubled efforts on the part of the Orange institution, not only to uphold, but to increase them, evidently violating military law, and aggravating its violation by concealing from the officers of the different regiments, and from the commander of the forces—from all, in fact, but Orangemen—the fixed determination of fostering their institution; when soldiers are urged in official letters from the Deputy Grand Secretary of the society to hold meetings, notwithstanding the orders of the Commander-in-Chief to the contrary, but with instructions to act with caution and prudence, it is surely time for Government to take measures for the complete suppression of such institutions.*"

After setting forth the General Order of August 31, 1835, peremptorily enforcing the prohibitions of 1822 and 1829 against lodges in the army, the *Report* urges upon the House of Commons "the immediate removal from office of all public servants who shall continue or become members of any Orange lodge."

Thus far the *Report*. Such was the opinion unanimously formed of the loyalty of the inner circle of the Orange society after an exhaustive inquiry, and *from its own written and printed records*, by a Select Parliamentary Committee of English gentlemen, who represented every shade of the political opinions of their day, and all, or nearly all, of whom were Protestants. It should be noted that the London Grand Lodge, which is here referred to, was the supreme council and director, not merely of the lodges of Great Britain, but of the whole world, and that its persistent spread of disloyalty and disaffection in the nation's last resource—the army—cast a blot upon the whole Orange organisation, and made it a standing menace to the peace of the Empire.

Replying to "an humble address" of the House of Commons on the subject of Orange lodges in the army, his Majesty King William IV., in a reply read on August 15, 1835, made use of the following words:

"I have received your dutiful address, submitting to me

certain resolutions on the subject of Orange lodges in the army. My attention has been, and shall continue to be, directed to the *practices contrary to the regulations, and injurious to the discipline of my troops*. I owe it no less to the dignity of my Crown than to the safety of the country, and the welfare of my brave and loyal army, to discourage and prevent any attempts to introduce secret societies into the ranks; and you may rely on my determination to adopt the most effectual means for that purpose."

On the motion of Lord John Russell, this answer of the King was entered in the *Journals* of the House of Commons.[21]

SECRET ARTICLES, ETC.

4. There is one class of legal enactments which the Grand Lodges, all down the course of their history, have set themselves to defy, to ignore or to evade—namely, Acts passed with a view to minimise the evils inherent to the Orange system. This has been sufficiently demonstrated by the manner in which they not alone permitted, but applauded, the systematic and open defiance by the brethren of the provisions of the Party Processions Acts. All this is strangely inconsistent with the professions of men whose motto is loyalty, and who declare that one of the chief aims of their association is to promote among their members a dutiful submission to the laws of their country. The further we inquire into these professions the more evident it becomes that the fount of Orange loyalty is tainted at the source of its whole policy—the Grand Lodge. This will become more manifest when we consider the action of the Irish and English Grand Lodges in

(1) Retaining illegal articles, oaths, tests, etc.

(2) Defying or evading Acts of Parliament which declared the Orange society to be an illegal association.

(1) The rules of 1800 were drawn up by a committee appointed by the Irish Grand Lodge at a meeting held in Dublin on the 20th of November in the previous year. These rules were approved by the Grand Lodge and distributed to the members. They contain, among other things, the ten Secret Articles, which were safeguarded by special oaths, and kept hidden from the public eye until dragged into the light of day by Plowden in 1811, and again by the Parliamentary Select Committees of 1835.[22] Five of the ten Secret Articles are given here, together with such bracketed comments as they may call for:

"1. That we will bear true allegiance to his Majesty King

[21] *Journals* of the House of Commons, 15th August, 1835, folio 559.

[22] See p. 84, *supra*, *note* 3.

George the Third and his successors, *so long as he or they support the Protestant ascendency. . . .*" [The reader's attention is directed to what has been already said as to the price which the Irish Grand Lodge here sets upon the loyalty of the Orange body.[23] The same remarks apply to the Orange oath of 1799, to which I shall presently refer].

"4. *We must not give the first assault to any person whatever, that may bring a brother into trouble.*" [This article evidently implies that the "first assault" may be given in all other circumstances].

5. "*We are not to carry away money, goods, or anything from any person whatever, except arms and ammunition, and those only from an enemy.*" [This article is a recognition and adoption, by the Irish Grand Lodge, of a leading item of the old plundering policy of the Peep-o'-Day Boys, out of whose association Orangeism in its present shape arose. It is needless to say that with Orangemen, as with Peep-o'-Day Boys, Catholics were the "enemy." The reader will recall the declaration of Mr. Swan, Secretary of the Irish Grand Lodge, to the effect that the Catholic religion is "hostile to the State."[24] The Catholic is, then, the "enemy;" the Orangeman, the judge. Translated into plain terms, the fifth article, as Plowden remarks, simply means: "Whenever Orangemen assault a Catholic, or break into his house, they shall not rob him of his money or goods, but only of his arms and gunpowder."[25] The Armagh outrages of 1795 and 1796, the Reign of Terror of 1797 and 1798, and the raids, etc., of a later day, proved that Orangemen, even when wearing the Sovereign's livery, failed in a vast number of instances to discriminate very carefully between weapons and other portable property of value belonging to the "enemy"].

"6. *We are to appear in ten hours' warning, or whatever time is required, if possible* (provided it is not hurtful to ourselves or family, and that we are served with a lawful summons from the Master), otherwise we are fined as the company think proper." [It is unnecessary to point out the danger and illegality of large bodies of armed men being bound to appear at a specified place on a few hours' notice, given by an irresponsible, fanatical, and perhaps uneducated and intemperate lodge Master. The Fairman correspondence, published in the *Report* of the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835, shows that one of the uses which this article was intended to serve was to overawe and intimidate electors in the old days of open

[23] See pp. 252-253, *supra*.
[24] See p. 84, *supra*.
[25] Plowden, *Ireland from its Union*, vol. i., Introd., p. 81, *note*

voting, and thus influence election contests in a sense favourable to the political schemes of the Orange leaders.[26] Further reference will be made in the course of this chapter to other and still more treasonable purposes for which the Grand Lodge was massing the physical strength of the association in the period between 1829 and 1836].

The eighth of the Secret Articles ran as follows: "8. *An Orangeman is to keep a brother's secret as his own, unless in case of murder, treason, and perjury, and that of his own free will.*" [This article, as well as the oaths adopted by the leaders of Irish Orangeism, place the secrecy of lodge proceedings above many of the requirements of judicial procedure. The reader has aleady seen how both the leaders and the rank and file of the Orange association refused to divulge the secrets of the lodge, either in the interests of justice, or at the bidding of the nation's repesentatives in Parliament assembled].[27]

The illegality of these Secret Articles was fully admitted by the Irish Grand Secretary before the Parliamentary Committee of 1835, but he was unable to show, by the books of the Grand Lodge or otherwise, that they had ever been repealed The action of the rulers of the society regarding illegal oaths, etc., has been sufficiently dealt with in the sixth chapter of this volume.

CONDITIONAL LOYALTY.

One of the most curious and constant features of the Orange society—one which stands out in sharp contrast with its professions—is its well-known principle of conditional loyalty, which remains to this day an integral part of its settled policy. The rules adopted in 1800 by the Irish Grand Lodge not alone accept this principle; they bind members to it by oath. Nay, more: this oath requires of their Sovereign, as the price of their loyalty, a condition to which no just, enlightened, or liberal-minded ruler could give assent. This will be seen by the following portion of the "obligation of an Orangeman," to which reference has already been made in the course of this volume:[28]

"I, *A.B.*, do solemnly and sincerely swear, of my own free will and consent, that I will, to the utmost of my power, support and defend the present King, George the Third, and all the heirs to the Crown, *so long as he or they support the Protestant ascendency*, the Constitution and laws of these kingdoms."

(*a*) The common law of the period required of each subject absolute, unqualified, and perpetual allegiance to the Sovereign

[26] See pp. 132, *sqq.*, *supra*.
[27] See pp. 110-112, 115, 122-124, *supra*.
[28] See pp. 252-254, *supra*.

of the realm. The oath imposed by the Irish Grand Lodge on all Orangemen bound them to allegiance only so long as the Sovereign would "support the Protestant ascendency." Such an oath was conditional, qualified, temporary. It was therefore, at the time, of a treasonable character. This oath continued in full force among Orangemen all over the world until 1821, when, in consequence of its known illegality, and the too marked attention which the association had been receiving in Parliament since 1813, it was removed from the *printed* rule-books of the English society. It does not follow that the use of this oath was therefore discontinued. On the 8th of February, 1821, the Duke of York had consented to become Grand Master of the Orange society. In the following June a question regarding his acceptance of the office was asked in the House of Commons, and on the 22nd of that month the Duke wrote that he had learned "that the law officers of the Crown and other eminent lawyers were decidedly of opinion that the Orange institution, *under the oath administered to their members*, was illegal." He therefore withdrew from the association. Lord Hertford, Lord Lowther, and others followed his example.

(*b*) The reader will bear in mind that the oath in question does not merely stipulate that the Sovereign shall be a Protestant. That was not sufficient for the "loyalists" of the Irish Grand Lodge. He was required, moreover, to "support the Protestant ascendency." Reference to the twelfth chapter of this volume will enable the reader to realise the wide difference that exists between these two conditions, and to estimate the high reserve which the Irish, and afterwards the English, Grand Lodge set upon their loyalty, when, to use Judge Fletcher's words, they exposed it for sale in open market.[29]

Abundant reference has already been made to the scenes of confusion and violence which marked the campaign of the Irish Orangemen against Catholic Emancipation; and to the keen opposition which the English brethren offered to the repeal (in 1828) of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the admission of Protestant Dissenters to their full measure of political rights and privileges.[30] Even Orangeism would seem to have turned upside down at the Antipodes. The chief part of the membership of the lodges of Australia, the most inflammatory speakers of the July platforms, are supplied by those Dissenting Churches which the Orangeism of a generation ago did all in its power to muzzle and fetter with

[29] See pp. 251-252, *supra*.
[30] See p. 90, *supra*.

civil and religious disabilities. If they now happily enjoy the rights of free citizens, it is not because of, but in very spite of, the Orangeism which they now profess.

THE SOCIETY SUPPRESSED.

(2) The reader has already seen that the Orange society was plainly illegal at common law; that it acted in direct opposition to the Horse Guards regulations; and that its processions and general policy were incompatible with the preservation of public order. Parliament had, with no uncertain voice, condemned the principles and policy of the association in almost every year from 1813 to 1825. During the agitation for Emancipation, the association had become such a serious menace to public tranquility that it was suppressed in Ireland by an Act of Parliament, passed in 1825.

To judge from their oft-repeated professions of attachment to the Constitution and of unswerving obedience to the laws, one should naturally expect that the Irish Orange institution would have loyally bowed its head to the Act of Suppression, passed by the nation's representatives in Parliament assembled. The society was now distinctly illegal, not merely at common law, but by statute law as well. The Irish Grand Lodge issued a defiant circular to the brethren, and went through a farce of "dissolving" the association, which was carried on as before under an altered name. Their English brethren forthwith stepped into the breach, helped them to violate the law, and the organisation continued with unabated vigor its violent agitation against the civil rights of their Catholic fellow-citizens.[31] In the circular referred to, the Irish Grand Secretary says:

"Though from this day the Grand Lodge ceases to exist as a body, yet we do most sincerely and truly pledge ourselves . . . that, as individuals, we cherish the same principles at heart . . . and we shall ever feel pleasure in inculcating them to our neighbours and friends, and in instilling them into the infant breasts of our children, so that they may grow with their growth, and strengthen with their strength, and so be handed down entire and unimpaired from generation to generation."[32]

Under stress of the law, many of the Irish brethren did as their founders, the Peep-o'-Day Boys, had done in 1795: they assumed an *alias*. Henceforward, until 1828, a large number of the Irish lodges were known under the designation

[31] *Minutes of Evidence*, Irish Select Parl. Committee's *Report*, Q. 7063. For other methods resorted to by the Grand Lodges to avert or delay suppression, see pp. 121, *sqq.*, *supra*. See English Committee's *Report*, p vii., and Q. 2832-2838.

[32] *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 17, Irish Select Committee's *Report*. A promise of loyalty is made against "domestic treason or foreign invasion.'

of Brunswick Clubs. Under this title the Orange leaders in Dublin issued their orders and conducted the affairs of the association.[33] The writer of the article on Orangeism in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed.) says that the Brunswick Clubs were simply branches of the old Orange tree. The Parliamentary debates of the period, and the opinions expressed in the newspapers of the time, show that they were regarded simply and purely as Orange lodges, under the thin disguise of an *alias*. Their membership was the same, their policy the same. The agitation against Catholic Emancipation went merrily on; processions were carried out by them as before; outrages continued and multiplied; every distinctive feature of the principles, policy, and conduct of Orangeism was continued, without break or intermission, by the lodges which had now assumed the new title of Brunswick Clubs.[34] To use a term much in vogue in ecclesiastical literature of late years, the Brunswick Clubs were is strict moral and physical "continuity" with the lodges of the Orange association.

This, however, was not the only expedient to which leaders of the Orange association resorted for the purpose of defying or evading the Act of 1825. Another method was devised, which is thus detailed in the *Report* of the English Select Committee of the House of Commons (p. vii.):

"To evade the law, the word *warrant* was substituted for *lodge*. The original form was to grant a warrant to hold a lodge in a particular house or place; and by the alteration it was given to the person to hold a lodge wheresoever he pleased. *It has been a rule that Irish warrants cannot be acted upon in England, or English warrants acted on in Ireland*; and a new warrant is therefore given in exchange, as a matter of course, on application. It is particularly deserving of notice that when the Grand Orange Lodge was discontinued in Ireland in the years 1825 to 1828, *the Loyal Orange Institution of England issued warrants, under which lodges were held in Ireland; and the objects and intentions of the law were thus frustrated.*"

In the cases where the brethren did not alter the title of their lodges to that of Brunswick Clubs, or where they could not, or would not, incur the expense of procuring English warrants, they dispensed with such formalities, and held their meetings as they had done before the Act of Suppression was passed.[35] Mr. Richardson Bell, an Ulster Protestant magistrate, deposed before the Select Committee of 1835 that during the period of suppression (1825 to 1828) the Orange lodges

[33] "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 162.
[34] *Ibid.*, Cf. *Minutes of Evidence*, Third Irish *Report*, Qq. 7062-7072.
[35] *Minutes of Evidence*, *ibid.*

continued to be held in the neighbourhood of Dungannon with the same frequency and regularity as before; that the processions were of precisely the same character as before the passing of the Act; the brethren, on the usual occasions for these displays, "marching through the town and behaving in a most ridiculous manner; so much so, that none but low Orangemen would associate with them."[86] The *Belfast News-Letter* (a Protestant organ) of July, 1826, 10th July, 1827, 12th July, 1828, corroborates the testimony of Mr. Bell, and shows that what it expressly terms "Orange lodges" still continued to be illegally held over Ulster under their proper designation, and that processions of "Orangemen" were held in great numbers, just as if no Act of Suppression had ever been passed.[87] In some places—as, for instance, at Dungannon—the processions were headed by several Orangemen of rank, "dressed in costumes suited to the occasion." The reader must solve for himself the question as to how, in the face of the testimony that has been here adduced, the Irish Orange Institution could declare that it had "dissolved" in deference to the Act of Parliament of 1825.

THE CUMBERLAND PLOT.

The period of most feverish and seditious activity in the history of the Orange organisation extended from about 1828 to 1835. "Towards the close of the period before us," says Killen, "the Orange institute suddenly collapsed. Notwithstanding their loud professions of loyalty, its adherents had been recently involved in treasonable designs. The passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1829 had driven them almost to madness, and ever since their movements had been marked by recklessness and folly."[88] This was the period during which the English and Irish Grand Lodges were most active in corrupting the fidelity and undermining the discipline of the army, and in preparing the brethren—close on half a million in number—for a revolution or a civil war.

The period here referred to covers the operations of the Cumberland Plot, which occupies as well-known a place in history as the Cato Street Conspiracy of 1820. No reference to the loyalty of the governing body of the Orange society would be complete without at least a few leading facts regarding the Cumberland scheme. From the passing reference made

[86] *Minutes of Evidence*, Third Irish *Report*, Q. 7063.

[87] *Ibid*, Qq. 7062-7072; cf. Qq. 5929-5934. These processions of Orangemen were held at Lisburn, Hillsborough, Dungannon (170 lodges), Dromore, Kilmore, Saintfield (40 lodges), Portadown (30 to 40 lodges), Lurgan (80 to 90), Ballymoney (28 lodges), Ballymena, Antrim, Coleraine, etc.

[88] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii,, p. 463.

to it in a previous chapter, the reader is already aware that the object of the conspiracy, as stated by historians of the time, was to alter the succession to the Throne of England: to set aside the just and legalised claims of the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, and to place the crown on the head of the Imperial Grand Master of the Orange society, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland. Dr. Killen, the Presbyterian historian, says that the investigations of the Parliamentary Committee of 1835 "revealed the existence of a conspiracy to exclude the Princess Victoria from the succession, and place the Duke of Cumberland on the Throne."[39] Miss Martineau, a contemporary Protestant historian, thus refers to the plot in her *Thirty Years' Peace*:[40]

"The revolutionary movement referred to as occurring at the other end of society was one which it would be scarcely possible to credit now, but for the body of documentary evidence which leaves no shadow of doubt on any of the principal features of the conspiracy. The whole affair seems so unsuited to our time and the conditions of our monarchy—so like a plunge back into a former century—that all the superiority of documentary evidence of which we have the advantage, is needed to make the story credible to quiet people who do not dream of treason, plots, and civil war in England in our day."

The "body of documentary evidence" here referred to goes to show that the conspiracy was conducted by the members of the Imperial Grand Lodge of London, who guided the votes, policy, and destinies of all the scattered fragments of Orangeism throughout the world. Among those who seem to have been most deeply implicated were Lords Kenyon, Wynford, Longford, and Roden, the Duke of Gordon (Deputy Grand Master for Scotland), and the Marquis of Londonderry. The leading rôles in the plot are, however, by general consent, assigned to the Duke of Cumberland and his intimate friend and familiar, Deputy Grand Secretary Lieutenant-Colonel Blennerhasset Fairman.

The character and antecedents of the Duke of Cumberland eminently fitted him for the headship of the Orange organisation, and for a leading part in such an enterprise as that with which his name has been inseparably associated ever since 1836. He was brother of the reigning king, William IV. He had learned his ideas of morality in the corrupt courts of the Georges, which, says an eminent historian of our time, had "a full flavour such as a decent tap-room would hardly exhibit in

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 464.
[40] Vol. ii., chap. v., p. 266.

a time like the present." There were few, if any, of the old *roués* of his day more cordially hated than the Imperial Grand Master of all the lodges. He was, says Spencer Walpole, "the least reputable and the most unpopular of the King's brothers."[41] His brother, George IV., thus explained to the Duke of Wellington the cause of Cumberland's extreme unpopularity: It was, said the King, "because there never was a father well with a son, a husband with his wife, a lover with his mistress, or a friend with his friend, that he [Cumberland] did not try to make mischief between."[42] His character is thus summed up by Mr. Justin McCarthy:[43]

"His manners were rude, overbearing, and sometimes even brutal. He had personal habits which seemed rather fitted for the days of Tiberius, or for the court of Peter the Great, than for the time and sphere to which he belonged. Rumour not unnaturally exaggerated his defects, and in the mouths of many his name was the symbol of the darkest and fiercest passions, and even crimes. Some of the popular reports with regard to him had their foundation only in the common detestation of his character and dread of his influence. But it was certain that he was profligate, selfish, overbearing, and quarrelsome. A man with these qualities would usually be described in fiction as, at all events, bluntly honest and outspoken; but the Duke of Cumberland was deceitful and treacherous. He was outspoken in his abuse of those with whom he quarrelled, and in his style of anecdote and jocular conversation, but in no other sense." After referring to the unpopularity of the Duke of Cumberland, the historian just quoted goes on to say: "He was believed by many persons to have had *more than* an indirect, or passive, or innocent share in the Orange plot discovered and exposed by Mr. Hume in 1835 for setting aside the claims of the young Princess Victoria, and putting himself—the Duke of Cumberland—upon the Throne: a scheme which its authors pretended to justify by many preposterous assertions that they feared the Duke of Wellington would otherwise seize the Crown for himself."

ENTER COLONEL FAIRMAN.

Lieutenant-Colonel Fairman played the jackal to the Imperial lion of the lodges. He had been an Orangeman since 1815, and was introduced into the Imperial Grand Lodge of London under the following significant circumstances:

---

[41] *Hist. of England*, vol. ii., pp. 505-506.
[42] The Greville *Memoirs: Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and of King William IV.*, vol. i., p. 218 (Longman's ed., 1884).
[43] *History of Our Own Times*, vol. i., pp. 16-17.

1. During the illness of George IV., Fairman had done all in his power to have a Regent appointed—the Regent to be none other than H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland. He had also spoken slightingly of the Princess Victoria's claims to the Throne.[44]

2. While Fairman was thus establishing a claim on the Duke of Cumberland, the Deputy Grand Secretary of the Orange institution was an Irishman named Chetwoode Eustace Chetwoode. He is described as "an honest, simple-minded man in his way—certainly not one fitted for treasons, stratagems, and broils."[45] It was decided to get rid of him. He was charged with not having kept the books and accounts in proper order, called upon by the Grand Lodge—apparently in all seriousness—to prove that he was not a Papist, and dismissed. From the evidence received by the Parliamentary Committee (English) of 1835, we find that, a short time *previous* to his dismissal, two tylers of the Grand Lodge (Condell and Osborne) and another Orangeman (Payne) broke into Chetwoode's Chambers in Lyons' Inn during his absence, and abstracted therefrom all the papers they could lay their hands upon. The complicity of the Grand Lodge in the robbery is evidenced by the fact that the thieves were paid for their services by Fairman, and that some of the stolen documents were subsequently produced before the Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835. Chetwoode was thus quietly deprived of the only weapons by which he might have been formidable to those who afterwards sat in judgment on him.

3. Before his appointment, Fairman had several long private interviews with Cumberland at Kew. Immediately after one of these conferences, he was appointed to the office of Deputy Grand Secretary, *on the nomination of the Duke*, seconded by Deputy Grand Master Lord Kenyon.

4. Fairman's appointment was rapidly followed by a notable change in the whole policy of the organisation:

(*a*) A new and uniform system was devised, new signs and passwords were invented,[46] and every means taken to secure secrecy in the new departure now entered upon.

(*b*) The Imperial Grand Lodge now advocated an open resort to physical force and the terrorism of armed multitudes of the brethren, for the purpose of crushing opposition to their schemes.

---

[44] For instance, in his letter to the Editor of the *Morning Herald*, dated April 6, 1830.

[45] "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 203.

[46] Miss Martineau, *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 268.

(*c*) The loyalty of the army was tampered with systematically and on a large scale, by the agents of the Grand Lodge. The establishment of regimental Orange lodges was pushed by them with feverish activity, contrary to the well-known military regulations of 1822 and 1829.

(*d*) The Grand Lodge officers exerted themselves to have the Duke of Cumberland appointed Regent during the declining years of George IV. and William IV. They ignored or belittled the rights of the Duchess of Kent, and of the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, already established by Act of Parliament, and did all in their power to keep the person and what Fairman termed the "paramount claims," of Cumberland as prominently as possible before the public eye.

(*e*) Moreover, from the day of Fairman's appointment to the office of Deputy Grand Secretary, the Duke of Cumberland presided at the Imperial Grand Lodge meetings *in royal state*.

(*f*) The correspondence of the Grand Lodge at this period speaks of a great scheme being afoot, which will cause dismay throughout the kingdom, and which must be spoken of in whispers and enigmas even to officers of the Grand Lodge. Certain Orangemen testified on oath or otherwise that, to their direct knowledge, the avowed purpose of the Grand Lodge was to set aside the claims of the Princess Victoria, and to place the Duke of Cumberland upon the Throne. Such a conspiracy is fully in keeping with the language and conduct of the Grand Lodge during this period. On any other supposition they are well-nigh inexplicable.

THE PLOT THICKENS.

A few further facts in explanation of the brief summary just given above will enable the reader to grasp more fully all that is implied in the words "the Cumberland Plot." The particulars here given will be found in the *Minutes of Evidence* of, and Appendices to, the *Report* of the English Select Committee of 1835, in the Parliamentary debates of the period, and in the writings of well-known Protestant historians.

(*a*) Sufficient details have already been given in the sixth chapter, or will appear as we proceed, regarding the means adopted by the Imperial Grand Lodge to safeguard the secrecy of the newly inaugurated "forward" movement.

(*b*) *The policy of physical force.*—From the date of his acceptance of office, Fairman's letters[47] to the members of the Imperial Lodge contain, says the English Committee's *Report*, "a general

[47] Fairman's letters and those of other members of the Imperial Grand Lodge will be found in Appendix to *Report* of Select Parl. Committee (English) of 1835, and in Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*.

reference to the advantage of increase of numbers, of boldness of attitude, and even of physical force, to support the views of the Orange institution." "By a rapid augmentation of our *physical force*," wrote Fairman to the Marquis of Londonderry in June, 1832, "we might be able to assume a boldness of attitude which should command the respect of our Jacobinical rulers. . . . If we prove not too strong for such a Government as the present is, such a Government will prove too strong for us; some arbitrary steps would be taken in this case for the suppression of our meetings. Hence the necessity for our laying aside that non-resistance and passive obedience which has hitherto been religiously enforced to our discomfiture." In another passage already quoted from the same letter, Fairman commends the Irish Orangemen, who "were resolved to resist all attempts on the part of the Government to put them down." The Deputy Grand Secretary is still more outspoken in a letter written on the 11th of August, 1833, to the Duke of Gordon, Deputy Grand Master for Scotland: "Our institution is going on prosperously," said he, "and my accounts from all quarters are of the most satisfactory kind. By our next general meeting we shall be assuming, I think, such an attitude of boldness *as will strike the foe with awe;* but we inculcate the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance too religiously by far." In another letter he favours giving the Irish lodges "that support which would give *vigour* to their proceedings, and which would be *an eternal source of terror to the enemy*." In June, 1833, Fairman writes to another Orange leader, Lord Longford: "We shall speedily have such a moral and physical force, I trust, as will strike with terror and sore dismay the foes of our country."

(*c*) *The army.*—After having despatched the letter to the Marquis of Londonderry, from which I have quoted above, regarding the use of physical force in support of the views of the Grand Lodge, Fairman wrote again on the 30th of July, 1832: "In my letter of Saturday I omitted to mention that *we have the military with us as far as they are at liberty to avow their principles and sentiments.*" The army, then, was to be an important factor in the conspiracy of intimidation and terrorism which was being planned by the Imperial Grand Lodge. In the course of this chapter abundant reference has already been made to the feverish energy with which the loyalty and discipline of the army were being undermined in the interests of the Orange party. According to a statement then made by Mr. Hume, a Protestant M.P., in the House of Commons, the Irish yeomanry were at this period "all Orange." They alone were amply sufficient to hold Ireland for the Duke of Cumber-

land. At the same time, as we have seen, the regular forces stationed in England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as in Canada and Australia, were, *by Cumberland's directions*, so successfully tampered with, that bodies of them frankly defied the General Orders of the Horse Guards, for the purpose of obeying the behests of the Imperial Grand Lodge. When the conspiracy was discovered, there were over fifty regiments in the service whose fidelity could not be counted upon. To these we may add the Irish yeomanry forces, and the 340,000 to 360,000 Orange civilians, who, according to the evidence of the Grand Lodge officers examined by the English Parliamentary Committee, were scattered about through Great Britain and Ireland. According to the same Committee's *Report*, most of the Orange civilians were armed, and all the members of that vast organisation—perhaps close on half-a-million of armed men—were bound to assemble at the command of Grand Master the Duke of Cumberland, who thus held in his hands all the elements of a rapid and successful revolution. As already stated in these chapters, it was this power of rapidly and secretly mobilising vast bodies of armed fanatics, which, in the eyes of the English Parliamentary Committee of 1835, formed a menace to the safety of the Empire, and made the suppression of the Orange association "imperatively necessary."

"FLYING AT HIGH GAME."

(*d*) Lord Brougham in his *Life and Times*, Miss Martineau in her *Thirty Years' Peace*, and other contemporary writers, looked upon the Duke of Cumberland as an arch-schemer, whose hungry eye was ever fixed upon the Crown of England. Lord Brougham tells how, in the days of George IV., the Duke "kept himself for some time after his return [from Hanover] in the background, knowing how unpopular he was all over England, with the single exception of the Universities of Oxford and Dublin; but he had now broken through this discreet resolution, and was putting himself more and more in the public eye. At the time I speak of [1833] he had assumed the position and attitude of a leader, as the chief of the Ultra party; and, with Kenyon and Falmouth for his supporters, and Wynford to back him up, he claimed as distinguished a place as the Duke of Wellington on the Opposition side of the House of Peers. He no longer confined himself to asking a question upon the order of business, or on a point of form; he spoke upon the gravest and largest subjects; and in one evening he spoke two or three times, one of these being on the Poor Law Bill. It became, therefore, manifest that his Royal

Highness now *thought himself destined to play a great part, and he was flying at high game.*"[48]

Not only in the House of Lords, but out of it as well, the Duke's new policy received the eager support of the other members of the English Grand Lodge. Deputy Grand Master Lord Kenyon, for instance, writing to Fairman as far back as December 28, 1832, expresses a wish that Cumberland would "attend in addition to what is popular." Fairman, in his letter of February 12, 1833, to Lord Kenyon, says: "I believe I mentioned that I had consulted his lordship [Lord Wynford] on the propriety of my continuing to introduce the Duke's name in the prominent shape I had previously done, *and with the policy of which he seemed to agree.*" In fact, Lord Wynford's letter of October 24 urged him to make certain mysterious "appeals" on Cumberland's behalf to "sure Tories," and to them only. Fairman's letter to Lord Kenyon, referred to above, shows that he had been puffing up the Duke to such purpose in and about Doncaster, that "if he [Cumberland] would but make a tour into these parts, *for which I have prepared the way*, he would be idolised." Following fast upon this came another letter, also to Lord Kenyon, Cumberland's other right-hand man. He tells how, at a meeting which he had convened, he himself (Fairman) and the gentlemen and ladies ("the blue belles of Yorkshire," as he terms the latter) who were present wept at the bare mention of the name of the profligate old Duke. The same letter recounts how, at the same time, at Fairman's direct or indirect suggestion, a movement was set afoot among the local magnates to subscribe £50 each for the purpose of providing a great entertainment for his Royal Highness, "if they might be permitted to look forward to so distinguished an honour as a visit from him."

FLOATING RUMOURS.

Cumberland was an accomplished intriguer,[49] and his ambitions were well known. In the closing days of George IV. a scheme had been set on foot to appoint a Regent. It is needless to state that the candidate put forward by Fairman and the Orange party for that high office was none other than their Imperial Grand Master. In a letter to Earl Grey, Lord Brougham expressly says in his *Life and Times:* "In fact, *he*

[48] *Life and Times* of Lord Brougham, vol. iii., pp. 273-274. Blackwood: 1871. Cumberland was strongly opposed to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (Spencer Walpole, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii., p. 474). He was also a violent opponent of Catholic Emancipation (*Ibid.*, pp. 517, 518; Rev. G. N. Wright, *Life of William IV.*, vol. ii., p. 579).

[49] See Spencer Walpole, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii., pp. 505-506; Greville's *Journal etc.*, vol. i., p. 222.

[Cumberland] *wants to start for the Regency under the Orange colours*—to make the Brunswick Clubs [the lodges of the time] his handle for the purpose of setting himself up with the country." Shortly after the accession of William IV., there was a violent debate over the Regency Bill. The right of succession was then settled on the Princess (now Queen) Victoria, who was at the time a minor. Her mother, the Duchess of Kent, was to be Regent in the event of the death of William IV. before the young Princess came of age. This arrangement, however, proved extremely distasteful to the Orange leaders. Cumberland's party industriously circulated rumours which were significantly favourable to the schemes of the Imperial Grand Master, and which contained contemptuous references to the legalised claims of the Princess Victoria. The rumours referred to were to the effect :

(1) That the Duke of Wellington was about to seize the Throne.

(2) That King William IV. was insane, and should therefore be superseded.

(3) That the Princess Victoria was only "a woman and a minor," and that if she succeeded to the Throne she would become a Papist.

These rumours were, in fact, so many appeals, on behalf of the Duke of Cumberland, to two of the most cherished conservative instincts of the British public of the time, namely :

(*a*) The dread of a revolution or of a civil war, such as would in all likelihood result from any attempt to alter the succession to the English Throne;

(*b*) The dread of a break in, or termination of, the Protestant succession.

At the same time the leaders of the Imperial Grand Lodge set vigorously to work to keep before the public eye, and to otherwise actively support, what Fairman termed the "paramount claims" of Ernest, Duke of Cumberland.

(1) Miss Martineau tells us that, in 1835-1836, members of the British Parliament "were aware how the loyal Orangemen had listened to suggestions for making the Duke of Cumberland King, to prevent the usurpation of the Crown by the Duke of Wellington; for expecting that William IV. would be superseded on the allegation of insanity, and the Princess Victoria because she was a woman and probably still a minor."[50] Cumberland's jealousy of the Duke of Wellington was notorious.[51] Lord Brougham has already told us how the

[50] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 270; cf. *Pict. Hist. of England*, vol. vii., p. 490.

[51] Spencer Walpole, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii., pp. 505-506.

Imperial Grand Master had succeeded, if not in filching from, at least in sharing with, the old hero of Waterloo the leadership of the ultra-Tory party in the House of Lords. Fairman wrote to Cumberland, acquainting him with the supposed "rash designs in embryo" of the Duke of Wellington, "so as the better to design measures for its frustration; at any rate," he continues, "you would not be taken by surprise, as the nation was last year, but might have an opportunity of rallying your forces, and of organising your plans for the defeat of such machinations as *might be hostile to your paramount claims*. Hence, should the experiment be made, and its expediency be established, your Royal Highness would be in a situation to contend for *the exercise in your own person of that office* at which the wild ambition of another may prompt him to aspire." Two subsequent letters of Fairman's explain that this "other" person was the Duke of Wellington—"the devoted Wellington," who, says Miss Martineau, "imperilled his reputation for consistency, and what his party called political honour, over and over again, rather than desert his Sovereign."[52]

(2) The same writer tells how, "from one occasion to another, rumours of the insanity of King William came floating abroad from the recesses of Toryism [Cumberland's party], till exploded by contact with free air and light." In a passage already quoted, she states that this alleged insanity was seized upon by the Orange party as a reason for deposing the reigning King in favour of the Duke of Cumberland. According to the written testimony of Heywood, a Sheffield Orangeman, Deputy Grand Secretary Fairman assured the brethren, in 1832, that the deposition of William IV. was "not improbable."[53]

ONLY A WOMAN.

(3) All this time the young Princess Victoria had been kept in comparative retirement by her careful mother, far removed from the corrupt surroundings of the English Court of those days. Her seclusion was so complete, even when the King's health was failing, that Greville wrote in his *Memoirs:* "What renders speculation so easy and events so uncertain, is the absolute ignorance of everybody, without exception, of the character, disposition, and capability of the Princess. She has been kept in such jealous seclusion by her mother (never having slept out of her bedroom, nor been alone with anybody but herself and the Baroness Lehzen) that not one of

[52] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 269.

[53] Heywood's letter to Deputy Grand Master Lord Kenyon, quoted in Appendix to English Committee's *Report*. See this chapter, *infra*.

her acquaintance, none of the attendants at Kensington, not even the Duchess of Northumberland, her governess, have any idea what she is or what she promises to be."[54] King William IV., who had a personal regard for his young kinswoman, complained bitterly of the rarity of her visits to the Court.[55] She was but little known or heard of by the mass of the English people at a time the Orange party were straining every nerve to keep the "paramount claims" of Cumberland as much as possible before the public eye. The Orange party sought to compass her exclusion from the Throne by the following chief methods:

(*a*) Appealing to the Salic law;

(*b*) Making the Duke of Cumberland Regent;

(*c*) Exciting the feeling of the British public against her:

(*d*) Acting as if she were already *de facto* excluded from the succession; preparing to secure by force, if necessary, the accession of the Duke of Cumberland in her stead.

(*a*) As far back as 1830, Fairman, in setting forth the claims of Cumberland, referred slightingly to the Princess Victoria as being "not alone a female, but a minor."[56] For a hundred and twenty years—ever since the days of Queen Anne—no woman had sat alone upon the Throne of England. The Salic law, which prevailed in all the continental kingdoms of Europe, prohibited the succession of females to the Crown. It existed in Hanover, whence Cumberland had come, and where, says Lord Brougham, he had "formed his habits of thinking, and his political opinions."[57] Had it been in force in England, the succession would have devolved by right upon the Duke, who was the oldest surviving brother of William IV. Hence—as the reader has seen by the passage quoted above from Miss Martineau—the fact of the young Princess being merely a female was advanced by the loyal Orangemen as a pretext for setting aside her claims to the Throne, even though her rights had been ratified by Act of Parliament.

(*b*) Had the Imperial Grand Master become Regent in the declining days of William IV., his position, backed by over a quarter of a million of armed Orangemen and a disaffected army, would have easily enabled him to hold his own against a comparatively unknown girl, who had little to depend upon beyond her virtue and her theoretical right. It will become

---

[54] Greville, *Journal of the Reigns*, etc., vol. iii., p. 403.

[55] *Ibid.*, 364, 367, 368.

[56] Letter to Editor of the *Morning Herald*, April 6, 1830, given in Appendix to English Parl. Committee's *Report*, and in Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*.

[57] *Life and Times*, vol. iii., p. 273.

evident to the reader as we proceed, that a deep purpose lay concealed in the defiant and feverish activity with which the Orange leaders systematically corrupted the fidelity of the army, and endeavoured to make it subservient to their schemes. Cumberland and his compeers had joined an association whose chief object is to commemorate a successful revolution which took place in 1688. On their own principles they could not seriously object to another "glorious revolution" in 1837, by which not a *de facto* King, but a merely *de jure* Queen, whom they slighted, would be set aside in the interests of the Orange institution.

(*c*) Yet another rumour was set afloat at this period, which was well calculated to rouse the passions of the British public against the Princess Victoria. It was to the effect that, upon her accession, she would become a Papist.[58] In the state of the law and of public feeling on the subject of the Protestant succession, this was tantamount to an appeal to the people of England to set aside the claims of the young Princess. The rumour appears to have originated with Cumberland's party. It is unnecessary to state that the Imperial Grand Master was the only person who was likely to be benefited by the spread of such a groundless and apparently carefully planned tale.

(*d*) It is a matter of history that the heir-apparent, the Princess Victoria, was deposed in advance by some of the ardent spirits who sat around the Grand Lodge table with Ernest of Cumberland. Shortly after Fairman's tour among the military and civilian lodges of the British Isles, it was decided to issue an address to the Carlton Club, in the name of the whole Orange institution. The draft of this address[59] (written by an Irish member of the Imperial Grand Lodge) referred to the Duke of Cumberland as being "*the nearest to the Throne.*"[60] The rights of the present Queen were thus completely set aside in favour of the Orange pretender. The words just quoted were subsequently modified. None the less, when coupled with the other facts of the conspiracy, they serve

[58] This rumour gained such currency among the Tory party that, shortly after her Majesty's accession, their organ, the *Times*, warned her that if she were to become a Catholic, or to marry one, "or in any manner follow the footsteps of the Coburg family," such a course would bring about an "immediate forfeiture of the British Crown." Quoted by "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, p. 201.

[59] Quoted in Appendix to *Report* of English Select Parl. Committee of 1835.

[60] The words were subsequently altered to "the first male subject in the realm." Even the latter phrase is not without its significance, when we couple it with the question of the succession, and the references of the Orange party to the Princess Victoria as being merely a female and a minor.

to indicate the direction in which the current of Imperial Lodge thought and feeling was setting at the time. Another significant expression is found in an address presented by the Orangemen of London to the Duke of Cumberland. The brethren voice the hope that his Royal Highness may long be spared *to watch over the destinies of the nation.*[61] As we proceed, reference will be made to the manner in which the brethren were sounded as to their preparedness for civil war, in the event of the seizure of the crown by their Imperial Grand Master.

PLAYING AT BEING KING.

(*e*) It has been stated above that, immediately after the appointment of Fairman to the office of Deputy Grand Secretary, the Duke of Cumberland presided at the meetings of the Imperial Grand Lodge with royal state and circumstance. For instance: (1) the Royal Arms were affixed to all lodge documents; (2) a Great Seal was used by him, corresponding with the Great Seal of the Empire; (3) Colonel Fairman, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee of 1835, admitted that "the Grand Committee sat like a Cabinet or Privy Council;" (4) the Duke, on entering or leaving the lodge, was always preceded by a mace borne in state before him; (5) at the meetings he sat behind the mace; (6) no one was appointed to membership of the Grand Lodge except with his consent;[62] (7) all the members, grand dignitaries, and reverend functionaries were bound to attend in their full regalia or canonicals; (8) the Imperial Grand Master, still in imitation of royalty, had an absolute veto on all propositions, and allowed no discussion whatever to take place on his opinions or arrangements.[63] In the printed proceedings of the Imperial Grand Lodge for June 4, 1833,[64] the Duke of Cumberland issued the following fiat with a view "to simplify the proceedings of the institution as much as possible." "Individual opinion," said he, "is not to be consulted upon vital and important arrangements, involving the welfare and best interests of the institution." Some days before the issue of this ukase (May 30, 1833), Lord Kenyon had written to Fairman that no discussion should be permitted at Grand Lodge meetings, and that the Duke should "interdict the attendance of any brethren who would so forget themselves."

[61] The address is entered in the proceedings of a meeting held at Lord Kenyon's, given in Appendix to English Committee's *Report.*

[62] Kenyon's letter to Fairman, May 30, 1833.

[63] Molesworth, *Hist. of England*, vol. i., p. 377.

[64] Given in Appendix to *Report* of English Parl. Select Committee of 1835.

Cumberland was already putting in practice in the lodges the autocratic rule which he subsequently introduced among his unhappy subjects in Hanover.[65]

A CLOAK OF MYSTERY.

(*f*) The scheme of the Grand Lodge was to be mentioned only to safe people, and to them only in whispers and enigmas. Fairman writing to Cumberland in 1829 or 1830, has, for instance, "a great divulgement" to make. He continues: "The divulgement I have expressed a willingness to furnish would be deprived of no small portion of its value" in the event of the recovery of George IV., who at the time lay ill. On October 24, 1832, Lord Wynford, another prominent member of the London Grand Lodge, wrote to Fairman an extravagant eulogium on the virtues and noble qualities of his Royal Highness Prince Ernest. After having stated that "the Tories have not been sufficiently grateful to him," the writer concludes with these pregnant words:

"As you are so obliging in your last letter as to ask my advice as to whether you should pursue the course you have so ably begun, I can only say that you must exercise your discretion as to the company in which you make such appeals as that which I have seen reported. When you meet *only sure Tories*, you may well make them feel what they owe to one who is the constant, unflinching champion of the party, and who, by his steady course, has brought on himself all the obloquy that a base, malignant faction can invent."

(1) Now, the "true" or ultra-Tories of the day had two leaders, Cumberland and the Duke of Wellington. Cumberland and his section of the party cordially hated the Duke of Wellington, and, as we have seen, professed to regard him as a public enemy and an aspirant to the Throne. In the eyes of Orangemen, and more especially of the Grand Lodge, the "unflinching champion" of their party would naturally be none other than their Grand Master, the Duke of Cumberland himself.

(2) There was a mysterious something which "only sure Tories" owed to their "unflinching champion."

(3) It was to be mentioned to none but "sure Tories," and to them only in whispers.

(4) It was, inferentially, dangerous to disclose it to any but "sure Tories."

---

[65] Lord Brougham describes Cumberland, whom he knew well, as "a rank, violent, ultra-Tory of the strongest Orange breed, and whose principles and propensities were purely arbitrary." *Life and Times*, vol. iii., p. 273.

(5) What was this mysterious something which "only sure Tories" owed to the Duke of Cumberland? It would naturally be one of two things: either (*a*) something in the *ordinary* gift of a political party, or (*b*) something *not* in their ordinary gift. If the former, why all this secrecy and whispering in dark corners? Similar dim foreshadowings of things to come are met with in a letter written at this period by the Duke of Cumberland to the Duke of Buckingham: "I shall ever be found at my post," says the Imperial Grand Master, "but think it better for you, being unwell, to nerve yourself for another occasion, as I know *you* are STAUNCH, and I can depend upon your support." (The italics and capitals are the Duke of Cumberland's).[66]

But the whole conduct of Cumberland and his fellow-conspirators of the London Grand Lodge goes to show that they aimed at securing something higher than the mere headship of a party, or a mere Regency, for their Imperial Grand Master. A proper idea of the mystery with which this project was surrounded can be gained only by perusal of the Imperial Grand Lodge correspondence of the period as a whole. Many of these letters, and presumably the most incriminating of them, were deliberately and obstinately withheld by Fairman from the Parliamentary Committee of 1835. He admitted that these letters related "decidedly" to the business of the institution, and that many of them were written "to Lord Kenyon on Orange business, *interspersed here and there with references which he would not make known to the Committee.*"[67] He refused to let the Committee read any portion of the letters in question, on the significant plea that by doing so he would establish a bad precedent in a country *where a man was never expected to convict himself.* As already stated in the sixth chapter of this volume, the Orange party in the House of Commons opposed the motion for the production of the missing correspondence. Fairman defied the order of the House. He was committed for breach of privilege, and promptly absconded. The mysterious letters have never since been brought to the light of day. The reader may judge for himself, as best he can, what must have been the contents of those presumably incriminating documents which the Orange party found it so necessary to keep from all risk of contact with the light of day. In her

[66] *The Courts and Cabinets of William IV. and Victoria.* The work was compiled by the Duke of Buckingham.

[67] See chap. vi., *supra*, pp. 113, 114. Miss Martineau, *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., pp. 276-277. According to Miss Martineau, it was proved in a court of justice that Fairman had given a false address for the purpose of getting rid of a troublesome creditor. *Ibid.*, p. 273.

Thirty Years' Peace, Miss Martineau writes that the Grand Lodge scheme must have been "a grave affair to the interests of the brethren, if we may judge by a letter of Lord Kenyon's to Colonel Fairman in January, 1833. 'The good cause,' writes his lordship, 'is worth all the help that man can give it, but our only trust must be in God. In the last two years and a half I have spent, I suspect, in its behalf, nearer £20,000 than £10,000.'" Lord Kenyon probably felt that he was casting his bread on the running waters, and that after many days it would return to him again in the shape of a high place in the kingdom, when the royal diadem should encircle the brow of the Duke of Cumberland. Fairman, however, was not at all times content to wait for his reward. In a letter to an unknown friend (published in the Fairman correspondence), he speaks of demanding compensation "from royalty" for services rendered. He states that he will appeal at first privately. Should that course fail, he threatens to air his grievance in pamphlets and papers, "when *a dread of exposure* may prompt them to do that which ought to have emanated *from a sense of gratitude*." Now (1) there was but one "royalty" that owed a debt of "gratitude" to Fairman for services, surrenders, etc., and that was his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, brother to the King. (2) Fairman evidently had possession of facts, the publication of which would be peculiarly inconvenient—in fact a source of "dread"—to "royalty." (3) The threatened "exposure" must have covered matters of a very incriminating kind, since Fairman supposed that their publication would produce a feeling of "dread" in the mind of a man of Cumberland's character. (4) Somehow—whether by friendly interview, or by the fillip of a threat—Fairman's claim to compensation seems to have been fully satisfied. Not alone did the threatened "exposure" of a royal person not take place, but, on the contrary, Fairman did all in his power, as the reader has seen, to shield the inner counsels of himself and his colleagues of the Grand Lodge from the search-light of even a Parliamentary Inquiry.

For the rest, the movements of the Orange leaders between 1829 and 1835 were marked, as the Presbyterian historian Killen states, "by recklessness and folly."[68] There is abundant evidence to show that, during this period, the Imperial Grand Lodge conspirators were prepared, in certain eventualities, to plunge the nation into the horrors of a civil war. A few extracts in point from the Fairman correspondence will suffice:

---

[68] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 463.

In a letter to Sir James Cockburne, bearing date July 14, 1831, Fairman refers in guarded terms to "the visionary scheme now afloat for the removal of all our political sores." He speaks of a coming "civil war," and says that "the formidable force now in review [the Orange society] wil hasten with cheerfulness to the arduous scene of action. By our late returns its numerical strength now exceeds 175,000, and is fast augmenting. . . . My own fine fellows, who come from the lodges in the capital and its environs . . . are staunch to the backbone. . . . At my summons they would assemble, and under my command they would place themselves for putting their principles to the test. I have strong reasons to be of opinion that *before long there will be some occasion.*" The aristocracy who were opposed to them will, he predicts, "fall at the arrival of the evil hour." The calm of the Reformers, he writes again, "is only a prelude to the gathering storm which is howling at a distance, and will draw on us anon." In a subsequent letter to Lord Kenyon (November 30, 1831) he declares that "on the arrival, however, of the day of reckoning," the "hell-hounds will be called on to pay the full penalty of their cold-blooded tergiversations." In his letter of August 11, 1832, to the Duke of Gordon (already quoted), he proclaims the determination of the Grand Lodge to adopt "such an attitude of boldness as will *strike the foe with awe. . . . The time is fast approaching when matters will be brought to an issue*, as a conciliatory course will be laid aside, and an opposite one will be resorted to." At a meeting of the Grand Lodge, June 4, 1833, Deputy Grand Secretary Fairman declared that "such a fire has been kindled in North Britain as *must speedily burst into a conflagration not easily to be extinguished.*" Deputy Grand Master Thompson stated at the same meeting that, through Fairman's mission to Scotland, a firm basis was laid "for a great accession of strength to the lighting up of a flame of Orangeism in the North, *which all the efforts of its opponents would never be able to smother.*"[69] As early as October, 1833, Earl Grey found the seditious activity of the Orange lodges such an obstacle to the enforcement of the law, that he asked Wellesley "to get an accurate account of *all* that is being done [by them], *to be laid before the Cabinet* when it reassembles officially."[70] The conduct and correspondence of the Imperial Grand Lodge during this period justify the conclusion that the supreme governing body of the Orange

[69]The English Parliamentary Committee, in their *Report*, direct the particular attention of the House of Commons to the meaning of these threats.

[70]Brougham's *Life and Times*, vol. iii., p. 309; cf. p. 315.

institution was actively preparing—should their purposes demand it—to plunge the country into the agonies of a revolution or of a civil war.

THE DENOUMENT.

Evidence more directly incriminating the Duke of Cumberland and the Grand Lodge is not wanting. In October, 1835, one Heywood, a Sheffield Orangeman, stated, in the course of a letter to Lord Kenyon, that Fairman, during his tour in 1832, had been instructed by the Grand Lodge "to sound the brethren how they would be disposed, in the event of King William IV. being deposed, which was not improbable, on account of his sanctioning Reform in Parliament; and that, that being so, *it would become the duty of every Orangeman to support his Royal Highness, who would then in all probability be called to the Throne.*" Heywood's letter appears in the *Report* of the English Select Committee. Other letters on the same subject fell into the hands of Mr. Hume, a Protestant M.P. He, with Mr. Finn, M.P., directly charged the Duke and his colleagues with heading a vast conspiracy to alter the succession to the Throne.[71] The *London and Westminster Review*, January to April, 1836, contains copies of a number of important letters bearing on the plot, which are not inserted in the *Report* of the English Select Parliamentary Committee of 1835.[72] The publishers offered to produce the originals in the event of the Duke of Cumberland being prosecuted. They also published *in extenso* the sworn depositions of an Orangeman, from which I extract the following:

"That he, the said W. B. Fairman [when presiding at an Orange meeting during his tour in 1832], drew comparison between his Majesty William IV. and the Duke of Cumberland, as regarded their attachment to the Protestant Church; that this was a critical time for Orangeism; that they ought to make a stand; that if any 'row' took place, would they rally round the Duke of Cumberland? that his Majesty had no right to sanction the revolutionary measures of the Government in passing the Reform Bill; that a 'row' was expected to take place. The result of all this on deponent's mind was,

---

[71] On the 12th of February, 1836, Mr. Finn proposed a motion in the House of Commons against the Duke of Cumberland and the Orange society, with a view "to secure a safe, peaceable, legal, and rightful succession to the throne of these realms."

[72] Dr. Madden, in his *United Irishmen*, vol. iv., p. xiii., says that proofs of the existence of the Orange conspiracy "that were considered of too formidable a character by the Government of the day to be published in a Parliamentary *Report*, exist in the hands of the gentleman by whom that Committee was moved for."

that Fairman was sounding them as to whether, in the event of a 'tumult' taking place, the Orangemen would adhere to the Duke of Cumberland in preference to the King." The original of these depositions was, at the time, in the hands of a distinguished lawyer, and was one of the documents on which the prosecutors of the Orange plotters meant to rely. The reader will note how this document accords as to its statement of facts with the testimony of the Orangeman Heywood, and as to its expressions, with the letters which passed between Fairman and his confederates.

"It was proposed," says Killen, the Presbyterian historian, "to commence a criminal prosecution against the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Kenyon, the Bishop of Salisbury [Grand Chaplain], Colonel Fairman, and others believed to be implicated in the scheme of rebellion."[73] The incriminated leaders thereupon decided to checkmate this move by prosecuting Heywood for libel, if possible before their own trial came off. The high position and influence of the plaintiffs, coupled with the tortuous ways of Orange witnesses and jurymen, might easily have led to a verdict favourable to their party, apart altogether from the merits of the case at issue. Miss Martineau says: "It was clear to the [Parliamentary Select] Committee that the evidence bore out Heywood's statements."[74] They retained eminent counsel for his defence.[75] The indictments were drawn up. The letters and other documents on which Heywood's counsel and the Committee relied, were placed in order. The public were on the tiptoe of expectation of seeing the King's brother and his associates of the Imperial Grand Lodge placed in the dock on a charge of high treason; "but meanwhile," says Killen, "Heywood, the chief witness against the conspirators—in an agony of excitement, created by a sense of the peculiarly dangerous position in which he stood—burst a blood-vessel and died. . . . Under the influence of alarm, all the English lodges were abruptly dissolved [*by Cumberland*], and, as the party was thus thoroughly humbled, it was deemed expedient not to press a formidable combination

---

[73] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 464. The proposal for the prosecution was made in the House of Commons, February 23, 1836, by Sir William Molesworth, a Protestant member. By their prosecution and conviction, said he, "the society will easily and quickly be annihilated, and a few years' residence on the shores of the Southern Ocean will teach those titled criminals that the laws of their country are not to be violated with impunity, and that equal justice is to be distributed impartially to both high and low." *Parliamentary Debates* of date.

[74] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 277.

[75] *Ibid.*

to extremities, and to give up the prosecution."[76] The revelations regarding the vast physical strength of the fraternity, and the extent to which they had tampered with the fidelity of the army, produced "a universal sense of danger in the leaders of all parties," and it was deemed "not safe to drive them [the Orangemen] to resentment or despair."[77] The prosecution was therefore abandoned.

During the debate on the proposed prosecution of the Duke of Cumberland and the other Orange leaders (February 23, 1836), the following resolution, moved by Lord John Russell, was *unanimously agreed to* by the House of Commons:

"That an humble address be presented to his Majesty, praying that his Majesty would be graciously pleased to take such measures as to his Majesty seemed advisable, for the effectual discouragement of Orange lodges, and, generally, of all political societies excluding persons of different faiths, using signs and symbols, and acting by associated branches."[78]

It is significant that the Orange leaders in the House of Commons had nothing to urge in either defence or extenuation of the conduct of the association. At the last moment, however, an attempt was made to induce Lord John Russell to omit the word "Orange" from the resolution. This he declined to do—determined that the verdict of the nation's representatives should be given directly against the Orange society. The address was presented to the King, and on the 25th of February, 1836, he sent the following reply to the House of Commons:

"I will willingly assent to the prayer of the address of my faithful Commons that I will be pleased to take such measures as may seem to me advisable, for the effectual discouragement of Orange lodges, and generally of all political societies excluding persons of different religious faiths, using signs and symbols, and acting by means of associated branches. It is my firm intention to discourage all such societies in my dominions, and *I rely with confidence on the fidelity of my loyal subjects* to support me in this determination."[79]

A copy of the King's reply was sent by the Home Secretary

[76] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 464-465. A threat was held out to the incriminated leaders of the Orange party, that the evidence available would be used against them in case they would attempt to reconstruct the English society, whether under the same or any other name. (Miss Martineau, *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 278). *The attempt was not made.*

[77] *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 278.

[78] *Journals* of the House, quoted by "M.P.," p. 221; cf. Killen, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 464.

[79] *Journals* of the House of Commons, of date.

to the Duke of Cumberland. It was at last evident, even to him, that Parliament and the nation had had a surfeit of the ways of Orangeism, and that they were determined to rid the country of an association so menacing to its peace and prosperity. He bowed to the inevitable, and then, and not till then, "took steps" to dissolve the English Orange institution. He had played a desperate game for high stakes, and lost. The English people experienced a sense of relief when he afterwards left the country, to play the tyrant in little Hanover.[80]

King William IV. had called upon all his *loyal subjects* to help him in putting down the Orange society. The Grand Committee of the Irish Loyal Orange institution met in Dublin to consider the situation, and, after debate, passed a series of resolutions to the effect that the *will* of the King [even when backed by that of Parliament] was not law, and that, therefore, they were strongly oppposed to dissolution. In its issue of April, 1836, the *Dublin University Magazine* said that "*the organisation of Orangemen was designed simply for the concentration of physical force*—these times demand the exhibition of moral power." It counselled dissolution, but hinted that the association "would still remain united in reality."[81] "The result was that the Irish society was abandoned by all who gave it weight or respectability. The disreputable portion of it threw off their yoke of allegiance, asserted that a royal proclamation was not an Act of the Legislature, and became more secret and more illegal than ever."[82] The Irish organisation was never broken up, and (says Killen), "notwithstanding the Disestablishment of the Episcopal Church, they [the Orangemen] continue to this very day to keep up an unhealthy excitement among the *lower orders* of Protestants throughout the country."[83]

"Such," says Miss Martineau, "was the institution—the great conspiracy against the national will and national interests, the conspiracy against the rights of all, from the King on the Throne to the humblest voter, or soldier, or sailor, or Dissenter, or Catholic—which was discovered by the energy and diligence of Mr. Hume in 1835."[84]

---

[80] Miss Martineau, *The Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii., p. 278; cf. Justin McCarthy's *Hist. of our Own Times*, vol. i., p. 17. King William IV. had long been anxious to get rid of the Duke of Cumberland. See Greville's *Journals of the Reigns*, etc., vol. i., 222.

[81] Quoted in "M.P.'s" *History of Orangeism*, p. 222.

[82] *Ibid.*, cf. *Westminster Review*, 1836 vol., p. 201.

[83] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, vol. ii.. p. 465.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 274. On p. 277 the same writer says that the country owed to Mr. Hume "the exposure and annihilation of this great conspiracy." Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth, while admitting a somewhat extensive belief

The Imperial Grand Lodge of London had lived long enough to prove itself and its following the most dangerous and crafty internal foe which has threatened the weal of the Empire in the present century. When its dark conventicles were ransacked, and some only of its secrets turned into the light of day, it sank, at the height of its power, under the stigma of an indelible disgrace. The Government of the day took prompt steps to prevent, as far as they dared, in the presence of such a formidable organisation, the recurrence of the underground plottings from which the country had been so narrowly saved. On March 15, 1836, a Treasury Minute was issued to all the Departments of the Civil Service. Having quoted the royal message given above, it continues: "It has become the duty of my Lords to use every proper means to carry into effect his Majesty's most gracious message. His Majesty has been pleased to express his reliance on the fidelity of his loyal subjects to support him in his determination. My Lords entertain no doubt of the result of this appeal to his Majesty's subjects in general; but they consider that it has specially become the duty of all who serve, in whatever capacity, under the Crown, to act in immediate accordance with his Majesty's most gracious intention. They desire, therefore, that a communication should be made to the respective Boards and Heads of Departments under their control (transmitting to them a copy of the Minute), and that they should be directed without delay to make it known to all persons acting in any capacity in their respective Departments. My Lords further desire that they should inform their officers that it is the express direction of this Board that every party who is now a member of an Orange lodge, or any political society excluding persons of a different religious faith, using secret signs and symbols, and acting by means of associated branches, should immediately withdraw from such society;

among certain classes at the time in the existence of the Orange conspiracy, displays a singular lack of acquaintance with the facts of the plot, and with the literature bearing on the subject. He appears, for instance, quite unaware of Cumberland's complicity with the spread of Orange lodges in the army, and has evidently not read that part of the Select Committee's *Report* which places the Duke's guilt beyond the reach of doubt. He, furthermore, gives no hint of certain notorious facts, such as the attempts made to have Cumberland appointed Regent; the attitude of the Duke's party towards the Duke of Wellington and the Princess Victoria; the testimony of Heywood and others; the proposed trial of various members of the Imperial Grand Lodge for high treason. He likewise appears to be quite unaware of the action of the Select Committee in providing for the defence of Heywood, and of the verdicts of the "well-informed" contemporary and later writers, who regard the existence of the Cumberland conspiracy as a matter which admits of no doubt.

and that no person in the Service shall hereafter become in any way a member of or connected with such a society. And if it hereafter become known to this Board that any public servant under their control shall, after this warning, either continue or become a member of such society, my Lords will feel it their duty, without hesitation, to dismiss him from the Service. Inform them further that my Lords rely on their carrying the intentions of his Majesty and the directions of this Board zealously and impartially into effect."

IN CONCLUSION.

I cannot more appropriately terminate this volume than by quoting from a Protestant magazine, the *Edinburgh Review*, of January, 1836, the conclusions which it based on the evidence laid before the Parliamentary Select Committees of the previous year:

"Our task is now nearly complete. We have seen enough of 'the proceedings, extent, and tendency of the Orange institutions of Great Britain, Ireland, and the colonies,' to feel satisfied that the existence of this 'oldest, best, and most sacred of institutions' is not for the peace or well-being of the community. It may be objected that many of its proceedings are so silly that they can scarcely be dangerous. But this is a mistake. The Orangemen, and more especially the Irish Orangemen, have had a firm and fierce faith in the truth and righteousness and utility of their pernicious institution. Founded on principles of exclusiveness and insolence, they have believed themselves to be meek and charitable; existing as a privileged minority amongst a conquered and oppressed population, they have considered themselves the injured and offended; combining against, or acting beyond, the law, they have thought themselves the most loyal of subjects; and reprobating bigotry, they have been at best but the bigoted persecutors of imputed bigotry. There are many, too, who have entered and used the association as a stepping-stone to power and connection, or who have seen in it an engine well fitted for securing that ascendency in Church and State which has been a fruitful source of ascendency in patronage and pelf to them and their party.

"There can be no doubt that Orangeism has been, and continues to be, hurtful to the very cause and principles *it professes* to support. Our charges against it are:

"That it has rendered Protestantism weaker than it found it.

"That it has fomented hostile and intolerant feelings between co-sects of the Christian religion.

"That by its annual processions and commemorations of epochs of party triumph, it has exasperated and transmitted ancient feuds, which have led to riots, with loss of property and life.

"That in consequence of the civil and religious antipathies thus engendered, the administration of justice in all its departments, whether in the bench, the jury, or the witness-box, has become tainted or suspected.

"That, prompted by the encouragement or remissness of former Administrations, the ambition or presumption of individuals has at length organised an association of nearly half-a-million of men, held together by secret signs, and an affiliation kept up through the Empire, contrary to law.

"That this society has strengthened itself by secretly introducing its lodges among the privates of more than fifty regiments, both at home and on foreign service, contrary to the known rules and regulations of the army. That gatherings, or demonstrations of physical strength, have been recommended by the executive authorities of the society both in England and in Ireland, and have frequently taken place to a great extent.

"That this association, addressing itself to the religious passions of the multitude, is placed under the absolute command of a Prince of the Blood, who, as Imperial Grand Master, has, amongst other powers, that of assembling the whole Orange body, as far as practicable, at any given place or time.

"These are grave charges. We have carefully quoted the authorities upon which they are founded."[85]

[85]Quoted by "M.P.," *Hist. of Orangeism*, pp. 219-220.

ST. ALEXIS ... LIBRARY

Appendix A.

THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN BELFAST, DERRY, AND ARMAGH—THE POSITION OF PROTESTANTS IN THE SOUTH AND WEST OF IRELAND.

REFERENCE has been made in the course of this volume[1] to the manner in which Catholics are excluded, in the great Orange centres of Belfast and Derry, from offices of honour and emolument in the gift of the people. The history of Ireland since 1795, and especially of the Ulster portion of it, furnishes, in melancholy abundance, instances of the rapid growth of the most violent forms of sectarian rancour which followed the spread of Orangeism throughout the country. The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of this volume supply many instances in point. Among the British colonies, Canada is a signal example. In Dublin, and the South and West of Ireland generally, circumstances over which the lodges had no control —the course of legislation and enlightenment, the movement of population, etc.—have to a great extent or altogether deprived the Orange party of the power of grinding the faces of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. This, coupled with the naturally tolerant spirit of Irish Catholics, will sufficiently explain the singular freedom of those portions of Ireland from the marked and constant displays of religious hate that form the bane of life in the Orange districts of Ulster. Belfast and Derry are singled out for special mention in these pages for the following reasons:

1. They are the twin capitals of the world's Orangeism.

2. Before the rise of the Orange association, the Protestants of Derry, and still more those of Belfast, displayed a spirit of generous friendliness for the Catholic body, which was not surpassed, if it were even equalled, by any other cities in Ireland.

3. The spread of Orangeism in Belfast and Derry was accompanied by a fierce and energising hatred of the Catholic body, which continues to the present hour.

4. The Orange party in Belfast and Derry have, almost to this hour, exercised complete control in Municipal and other

[1] See p. 7.

local matters, and have thereby been enabled to manifest the true inner spirit of the society in their dealings with their Catholic fellow-citizens.

5. The Catholics of Belfast and Derry have been, almost to the present moment, as really deprived of certain of the benefits of Emancipation, as if some of the provisions of the Penal Code were still unrepealed.

BELFAST.

Before the rise of the Orange association, Belfast—the cradle of the United Irish society—took the lead, as we have already seen, in the active movement initiated by Protestants, at the close of the last century, for the admission of Catholics to equal civil rights with themselves. Early in 1797 the Orange society secured a footing in Belfast. In due course it was strong enough to obtain control in Municipal affairs. From that fatal day Catholics have led the lives of helots in the capital of the North; and from no other place, except perhaps from Derry, came more violent opposition to Emancipation, and, generally, to every movement for the extension of a measure of civil rights to the overwhelming majority of the Irish population. An account of the sufferings of the members of the hated creed in Belfast would be quite beyond the scope of an Appendix. The following particulars of a form of persecution which in great part still continues, may, however, be of interest to the reader:

In 1892 a Select Committee was appointed to collect evidence with a view to the *Belfast Corporation, Lunatic Asylums, etc., Bill*, then before the House of Commons. In the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by them on the 9th of May of that year, we find the following facts, which are here placed in tabulated form. The reader is requested to bear in mind the fact that, as already stated in these pages, Catholics, according to the census of 1891, form 26·3 per cent. of the population of Belfast.

Elective Public Bodies.	Protestants.	Catholics.
Corporation:		
Members	40	none
Paid Officials[2]	89	2
Harbour Commission:		
Members	22	none
Paid Officials	37	none
Water Commission:		
Members	15	1
Paid Officials	7	none

[2]The Town Clerk's salary was £2500 a year (that of the Dublin Town Clerk £1200 a year); the combined salaries of the two Catholic officials in Belfast amounted to £265.

Elective Public Bodies.	Protestants.	Catholics.
Poor Law Board:		
Elected Members	22	none
Ex-officio Members[3]	21	1
Paid Officials[4]	91	3
Asylum Board:		
Members	19	3
Paid Officials[5]	65	8
Petty Sessions Clerks	6	none

Of the other most important elective offices, the two Clerkships, etc., and the Coronership were all held by Protestants. The Select Committee must have been strongly impressed with the treatment accorded to the Catholic minority in the head centre of Orangeism, for they excised from the Bill those clauses which conferred on the Belfast Corporation the same powers with regard to Industrial Schools and Reformatories, which were then, and still are, exercised by the Catholic Corporations of Dublin, Cork, and Limerick.

The position of Catholics in Belfast has by no means improved since 1892, as may be seen by the following extract from the London *Tablet* of February 29, 1896 (p. 327). The *Tablet*, I need not say, is a Catholic journal, but its politics are of the most pronounced anti-Nationalist type:

"After reading a little book of statistics just published at Belfast," says this organ, "no one can hug the fond belief that the Catholics there are not the subjects of a sectarian boycott. At the census of 1891 the Belfast Catholics were 70,234 out of a total population of 273,114, or more than a fourth of the whole, yet this quarter of the whole population has, it is stated, not a single representative among the ten Aldermen, nor among the thirty Councillors of the city. Out of 95 paid officials of the Belfast Municipality, drawing an aggregate salary of £20,000, only two are Catholics, and these are mere minor officials with salaries well under £200 each.[6] On the Board of [Poor Law] Guardians, Catholics have only three representatives[7] out of a total of 41, and only six paid officials of the Board

[3] See *note* 7, *infra*.

[4] Of the three Catholic officials, two were Work-house teachers, and one a nurse. There were forty Protestant nurses employed.

[5] The eight Catholics were attendants, of whom sixty-eight were employed.

[6] In the *Report* of the Select Committee on the *Belfast Corporation Bill* (1896) it is stated that the Protestant officials draw salaries amounting to £18,467; the Catholics, £294. *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 103.

[7] These three were *ex-officio*, and not elected, members of the Board. They were appointed because they held the Commission of the Peace within the Union, and had a higher property qualification than other justices. Evidence was given before the Select Committee on the *Belfast*

are Catholics, receiving £170, whilst the 164 Protestants receive between them £10,223 a year. On the Harbour Board there is now, apparently, no Catholic representative, and the only Catholic paid official of the Board is one of the pilot masters. Here the aggregate Protestant portion of loaves and fishes is £7,648, and the Catholic portion £130. Of the 17 Water Commissioners not one is a Catholic, and here the Protestant monopoly of salaried posts—of an aggregate annual value of £3,524—seems to be complete. Even the rate-collectors, the collectors to the gas offices, the architects and building surveyors, and the clerk of works at the pumping stations and outfall works, are all Protestants. All this seems to show that, with the Belfast Municipality, it is an axiom that 'no Catholic need apply.'[8] As a writer in the *Manchester Guardian* puts it, the list, 'unless it can be discredited as a whole, proves that Protestantism is the first qualification required of practically every salaried official of the Belfast Corporation, as well as of the members of all public bodies of which the Protestant majority of the ratepayers can decide the composition.' This is plain persecution, unless indeed one would go the length of trying to make a distinction between persecution and the deprivation of political power; between which, as Sydney Smith, with much robustness of phrase, declared, there was no more distinction than there was between 'the man who makes such a distinction and a booby.'"

The *Belfast Corporation Act*, which was forced by Parliament upon unwilling Aldermen and Councillors in 1896, provides for a very small modicum of representation to the Catholic ratepayers of the city. It does not, however, open the offices of emolument to members of the persecuted creed. Reference to the *Report* of the Select Committee on the *Belfast*

Corporation Bill (1896) that Catholics had no chance of being *elected* members of the Board. *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 6162-6163, 6292, 6495-6496.

[8] Various witnesses deposed before the Select Committee on the *Belfast Corporation Bill* (1896) that known Catholics have no chance of any appointment in the gift of elective public bodies in Belfast. See, for instance, *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 6495-6496. Mr. Pirrie, Lord Mayor of the city, stated before the same Committee that he voted only once to have a Catholic employed by the Corporation. The applicant was a lady. Her salary was only 14s. a week. Mr. Pirrie added that when he gave his vote *he did not know she was a Catholic*. *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 110-112. Sir Samuel Black, Town Clerk, solicitor, and former Alderman, deposed before the same Committee, as he had previously done before Mr. Dowse in 1864, that he would know a Catholic from a Protestant by merely looking at him. *Ibid.*, Qq. 1000-1001. For the power of the Orange body in the Corporation, see Q. 5745; cf. Q. 5747. A Jew, Mr. Jaffé, is allowed a seat in the Belfast Corporation, but not a Catholic. *Ibid.*, Q. 5596.

Corporation Bill will show that party feeling against Catholics still runs as high as ever in the head centre of Orangeism,[9] and that party expressions have lost none of their old bitterness.[10] The whole evidence as to the position of Catholics generally in Belfast may be summed up in the words of one of the witnesses regarding the poorer classes of them: "The Catholics of Belfast, so far as the working population is concerned, *are being simply tolerated*."[11]

DERRY.

In the second chapter of this volume brief reference has been made to the spirit of broad-minded tolerance which existed among Protestants in Derry before the rise of Orangeism, and to the religious rancour which replaced it when the brethren secured a firm footing in the Maiden City. It would be easy to multiply further evidence of the unhappy change wrought by Orange principles and practice in Derry. In this instance the situation was even worse, if possible, than in Belfast, inasmuch as it was and is the persecution of a majority of the population by an intolerant minority. The disabilities of the Catholic body have only been partially relieved—nearly seventy years after Emancipation—in spite of the protest of the local ascendency party, by the *Londonderry Improvement Act* of 1896. At the census of 1891, the population of Derry was 33,161. Of these 18,073 were Catholics, and 15,088 Protestants. Yet, owing to the careful "rigging" of the Municipal registers, and an artificial valuation, the Catholic ratepayers were deftly placed in a minority in each ward.[12] The old Corporation consisted of twenty-four members. I have a complete list of the members of the Corporation from 1866 to 1896 before me, and I find that during that whole time only two Catholics were admitted within the sacred precincts of the Council Chamber. One of these—the late Mr. Thomas O'Hanlon, ex-M.P. for Cavan—was elected through dissensions among the non-Catholic electors, and also by way of protest against the Corporation's scandalous neglect of the ward for which he was returned. He was not permitted to hold the seat long, notwithstanding his devotion to the electors' interests, and the fact that he was

[9] *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 6482-6484, 7043, etc.

[10] *Ibid.*, Qq. 5559, 6354, 6357, 6459. According to one of the witnesses, the party expressions used daily against the Catholics consist principally of insulting references to the Pope. See pp. 157-158, *supra*.

[11] *Ibid.*, Q. 5728.

[12] Another method of securing elections in Derry is very frequently adopted towards Catholic ratepayers who are in arrears of rent. They are served with notices to quit, and are thus disfranchised, before the day of the contest. *Report* of Select Committee on *Londonderry Improvement Bill*. *Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 10146, *sqq*.

a man of spotless character, and one of the largest ratepayers in the ward. The other, Mr. Charles O'Neill, was a man whose name was the synonym for every domestic and public virtue. A Protestant (but not Orange) paper, the *Derry Standard*, once appealed for the few non-Catholic votes necessary for his return, on the strange plea that, if the ratepayers rejected a man of his worth, because of his religion, no voice could ever be raised in defence of Ulster Unionists on English political platforms. Though Mr. O'Neill was the oldest and most respected member of the Corporation, he was never nominated for the office of mayor. Some time after Mr. O'Neill's death, in 1892, the *Derry Journal*, the Catholic local organ, appealed to the Protestant ratepayers for one, only one, seat out of the twenty-four, for Catholic representation. The Catholic candidate, Mr. B. Hannigan, was in every way unexceptionable. He held a large interest in the ward, was a magistrate, a man of culture, and a citizen of the highest integrity. Mr. Hannigan was defeated, although the ward which he contested had previously returned an Indian quack doctor of unsavoury reputation, who used to walk in the Apprentice Boys' Processions. A complete list of the members of the Corporation for 1895 appeared in the Dublin *Weekly Freeman* of April 13, 1895; and for the period up till November, 1896, in the *Derry Journal* of January 1, 1897. Not one of them was a Catholic. At the same time *all the paid officials* of the Corporation, thirty-two in number, were Protestants, drawing salaries amounting to £2,718 13s. 6d. per annum.[13] A Table published on p. 393 of the *Report* of the Select Committee on the *Londonderry Improvement Bill* (Q. 10048) shows that the Catholic *employés* of the Derry Corporation draw annually only £967 2s. This represents the whole amount which the Catholic majority of Derry receive out of about £22,000 annually expended by the Corporation of the Maiden City,[14] which sum, after deducting the small proportion which goes to interest, as well as the amount just mentioned as given to Catholic *employés*, all goes as "salary, wages, and benefits to Protestants."[15]

"There is then, no Catholic in the Corporation, nor among the Bridge Commissioners, nor in the Harbour Commissioners, except one who was [not elected, but] co-opted by the Harbour Commissioners themselves. The Bridge Commissioners are

[13] *Report* of Select Committee on *Londonderry Improvement Bill* (1896). *Minutes of Evidence*, Q. 10041, p. 392. The Table there given makes the number of officials 35.

[14] *Ibid.*, Q. 10049.

[15] *Ibid.*, Q. 10385.

selected by exclusive public bodies, and the members of the Harbour Trust are elected by open voting on a very high qualification. Add to this, that *all the paid officials of all three bodies are non-Catholics*, and some idea may be formed of the system of our local government."[16]

The Derry Corporation was not content with thus penalising Catholics because of their religion. They took steps to perpetuate the monopoly of their party, by proposing an extension of the city boundaries which would make the Municipal area as large as that of the city of Berlin, and such a re-arrangement of the wards as would deprive the Catholic population of any hope of fair representation in the future.[17] Parliament, however, rejected the proposal as to the boundaries, but permitted the exclusively Protestant Corporation to map out the new wards. The present municipal wards are the very divisions which the intolerant Tory Corporation had made for *the convenience* of their followers at the Parliamentary elections, and which were strongly objected to by the Nationalists of the city as being made in the Tory interest. Mr. Vessey Knox, the Protestant Nationalist representing Derry, made a strenuous, whole-souled effort to have a fair division of wards made, but he was defeated. Full justice still remains to be done. There are now sixteen Catholics seated with twenty-four Protestants on the new Derry Corporation.[18] But the division of the wards has

[16] *Weekly Freeman* (Dublin), April 13, 1895.

[17] *Report* of Select Committee on *Londonderry Improvement Bill. Minutes of Evidence*, Qq. 10241 to 10269.

[18] A list of the new Aldermen and Councillors, as well as of the paid officials of the new Corporation under the Act of 1896, is given in the *Derry Journal* of January 1, 1897. One of the latest proposals of the majority in the new Corporation savours strongly of the old spirit, with perhaps a *soupçon* of retaliation. It is their proposal to erect city cattle sale-yards at the very doors of the Catholic College and Christian Brothers' Schools, and Nazareth House, on ground purchased at enormous expense for the purpose. The old Corporation, which was exclusively Protestant, offered the (Protestant) Church representative body £5700 for the site. The Catholic Bishop offered £5100 for it, which was admittedly very far above its value. No person would think of making so high an offer as a mere private speculation; but the ground was specially valuable to the Bishop, as it was almost surrounded by Catholic (ecclesiastical) property. Besides, too, it had an historical value as being the site of St. Columba's monastery. The new Corporation, nevertheless, has ratified the proposal of their predecessors against the protest of the Catholic people. Nor would they agree to sell the portion immediately adjoining the Catholic property, though the Bishop offered them an almost fabulous price, and though many of the Corporators admitted the whole of the ground was not necessary for the purposes of a horse and cattle sale-yard. It is simply taxing the Catholics of Derry for the support of Protestantism; and it is moreover a grievous injury to the Catholic people, whose fine property is thereby seriously depreciated in value. On the day of the election for the new Cor-

been so scandalously partisan that the Catholics may be expected to retain only the seats of the one division which no "jerrymandering" could take from them. In Derry and Belfast, Catholics, for the purpose of self-protection, lived, for the most part, in one division of the city. The Orange Corporators, by their division of wards, have succeeded in locking up the Catholic vote in one district. The new Corporation, like the old, has thirty-two salaried officials, *not one of whom is a Catholic.*

Before leaving the subject of Corporate exclusiveness in Derry, I may, by way of illustration, mention two cases out of a long list which lies before me. In March, 1869, the illustrious Irish Protestant lawyer, Isaac Butt, was specially engaged at the Derry Assizes. The local Literary Association, whose committee was largely Protestant, and consisted of men of the highest respectability and commercial standing in the city, took advantage of Mr. Butt's visit to ask him to lecture in aid of their funds. Mr. Butt, it must be remembered, was not at the time in Parliament, and though a strong Nationalist, was not then the leader of the Irish people. He chose "The Republic of Venice," a singularly non-contentious subject, for his lecture. But the Orange mayor, Dr. Millar, refused the use of the Citizens' Hall, and finally only yielded to the weightiest pressure from Mr. Butt's immediate friends and relatives, who were amongst the largest ratepayers in Derry. About the same time the office of market-inspector became vacant. Mr. Richard Todd, who held a practically sinecure office from the old Corporation, proposed to do the work for £20 a year. But Mr. Todd was a Catholic, and rather than give him the office, the Corporation appointed a man of "the right sort" at a salary of £75, thus practically mulcting the citizens in a capital sum of £1100. The difficulty of finding any plausible ground of objection against the candidate was insuperable, and it is amusing to read the reasons given against his appointment. One councillor, Mr. A. Stewart, boldly stated that Mr. Todd was too gentlemanly and too good a man for such a paltry office, and that it was an insult to a man of his position and character to propose such an office for his acceptance. Other councillors supported Mr. Stewart's view. Mr. Todd was a citizen of the highest integrity and capacity.[19] Those who have not had practical experience of political life in Ulster find it difficult to

poration, the dead walls of the city were placarded with this appeal to the Protestant voters: "Remember, the fate of the Bishop's Garden depends upon your vote."

[19] See report of Corporation proceedings in *Derry Journal* of that date.

believe that men could be so intolerant towards those whom they must necessarily meet in every relation of daily life. I shall just give one illustration of the notion of fair play entertained by the organ of the lodges in Derry. When the late Mr. William McLaughlin, Q.C., was editor of the *Derry Journal*, he fearlessly advocated the cause of his persecuted co-religionists. As a consequence of his spirited and patriotic action, the local Orange organ called on the Protestants of the North-West of Ireland to starve out the Protestant proprietor of the *Journal* if he did not dismiss the Catholic editor.[20] The right of making known their grievances was to be denied the Derry Catholics.[21]

---

[20]Mr. McLaughlin, appearing for the Catholics and Liberal Protestants of Derry, before the Royal Commission (Derry), 1869, feelingly referred to this fact, in answer to some statements of Mr. Crawford, solicitor, who appeared in the Protestant (Apprentice-Boy) interest.

[21]The dignified protest of the Derry Catholics against the attempt of the Government to shield the titled and reverend Orange rowdies on the occasion of Lord Mayor Dawson's visit to the city, 1st November, 1883, deserves special mention. A few weeks before, the Crimes Act had been put into full force in Derry against some Nationalists, who were arrested on empty suspicion. Dublin Castle, controlled by certain permanent Orange officials, had a different set of measures for lodge offenders. Immediately after the Senior Commissioner, Mr. Piers White, Q.C., had explained the scope of the Inquiry, and stated that witnesses would not be required to give their evidence on oath, a solemn protest against the mode of investigation was made by Mr. James E. O'Doherty, the eminent solicitor whose name will be ever associated with the struggles, in his generation, of the Derry Catholics for freedom. The Catholics of Derry, by declining to recognise the sham Commission, drew the attention of the Three Kingdoms to the fact that Orange officials were ready to shield Orange criminals, though the charge against them was of the most serious kind. I append the historic protest, as it is given in the *Report* of the Derry Inquiry, 1883, Appendix A. It was unanimously agreed to by the Catholics of Derry:

"An inquiry into the events of November 1 was sprung upon the Catholics of Derry to-day, but the terms of the warrant and the statement of Mr. White have dissipated whatever hope the misleading notice of the inquiry might have excited. It is notorious that the position of the Catholics in Derry is little better than what it was before Catholic Emancipation. We have neither the protection of the law from outrage, nor hope of redress after its commission. On the other hand, an insolent minority has controlling influence not only in civic representation, but even in the appointment and removal of resident magistrates and police officers. In these things lie the causes which ever lead to disturbances in this city; but these things are not within the terms of the Commission, and could not without due notice and preparation be properly brought out. We would have endeavoured to assist the Commission, even if its object had been the very limited one of inquiry, how, in a city proclaimed under the Arms Act, an armed mob could seize and hold by force the Corporation Hall, or into the neglect of obvious precautions—the utter want of energy or self-possession when the crisis arose—and into the eternal contrast between the treatment of the majority and minority in this city. But these matters are not, in

The position of Catholics in the great Orange stronghold of Armagh city has been, almost up to the present hour, no better than that of their co-religionists of Belfast and Derry. "The Orange Town Commissioners" (as an Irish newspaper before me terms them) recently sought, and obtained from, the Local Government Board a Provisional Order for such an extension of their powers as would perpetuate the exclusion of Catholics from representation on, and public employment by, the local Municipal Council. But for the vigilance of Cardinal Logue, and the exertions of Mr. T. M. Healy, M.P., the Armagh Provisional Order would have passed through the House of Commons. Through Mr. Healy's intervention, two important clauses were added to the Order: the one bringing Armagh under the *Towns Improvement Act*, and giving the ratepayers a reduced franchise; the other providing that the town should be divided into three wards. Two Local Government Board Inquiries were subsequently held, at which the ward boundaries were arranged in such a manner that an instalment of justice has at length been done to the Catholic ratepayers of Armagh. This tardy and partial act of reparation was met with a torrent of abuse from the Orange press. The Dublin *Nation* of March 13, 1897, copies into its columns portions of leading articles on the subject from the *Ulster Gazette* and the *Armagh Standard*. The former is bitterly hostile to the Armagh settlement. The *Armagh Standard* refers to it in terms of coarse violence which recall the palmiest days of Orange ascendency.[22]

---

our opinion, within—and they certainly are not the main objects of—this inquiry; and even to ensure such an inquiry we will not assist the Government to evade its duty in the proper and firm and impartial administration of exceptional powers of criminal investigation; nor will we sanction by our presence this proposed kid-glove method of dealing with notorious rioters. The Commissioners declared to-day that they are prepared to hear even the criminals of the Corporation Hall. The assassin is to be at liberty to state on his honour his view of the circumstances of the First of November. We object to associate with such men in the witness-box, and we will not sanction by our presence the conversion of what should be a criminal investigation into a Commission of excuse. For these reasons, we decline to attend or give evidence at the Commission, and approve of the action taken by our representative to-day. Dated this 14th day of December, 1883."

[22]A few brief extracts will enable the reader (*a*) to gauge the bitter hostility of the Armagh Orange party to the extension of equal civil rights to their Catholic fellow-citizens, and (*b*) to note the similarity of the brethren's language, and the unity of their spirit, as regards Catholics, both in Ireland and Australia. In the course of the article in question the *Standard* makes a violent attack on Rev. J. Quinn, who had watched over the interests of the Catholic ratepayers. "The [chimney] sweep," says the *Standard*, "tells us we have a dirty face, the sewer-cleaner is an

A CONTRAST.

A pleasing and instructive contrast to the display of sectarian feeling in Derry and Belfast, will be found in the liberal treatment accorded by the "rebels of the West and South" to the Protestant minority who live in their midst. Most of the facts to be presently stated in a summary way will be found, with a wealth of detail, in a pamphlet entitled *The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland*, written in 1886 by Mr. Dawson (formerly Lord Mayor of Dublin and M.P. for Carlow), and published by the Irish Press Agency, London. It is needless to say that, since the appearance of that pamphlet, there has been no change in the attitude of broad-minded tolerance which Irish Catholics, where they are in power, have shown towards the adherents of other creeds.[23] I am here dealing exclusively with elective offices of honour and emolument which are in the gift of the people.

1. *Offices of honour:* (*a*) *Parliament.*—Irish Catholics could not, of course, be expected to cast their votes for representatives who, in Parliament, would oppose their political views, or those interests which affected their comforts, rights, or liberties. Irish Catholic constituencies are exacting as to a candidate's politics, which closely affect them. They look upon his religion as his own private concern. At each period in the progress of Parliamentary and Municipal Reform—in 1832, 1841, 1850, and 1884

---

authority on smells, likewise the Rev. John Quinn talks of bigotry and prejudice. The Irish priest is the last remnant of paganism in this nineteenth century. With not so good a social position as the ordinary Irish policeman, with good breeding at a minimum, and with pride and ignorance at a maximum, he cuts a sorry figure in these days." It describes the Catholic Church as "subtle, crafty, exclusive, grasping, and ever-grasping," and avers that she "will never be content until she has crushed the last semblance of liberty out of the wretches of whose throats she has got a grasp." It makes the usual references to the Jesuits and "their nefarious schemes, worked out in the dark, and put into execution in daylight with bland, smiling face;" and declares that Parliament ("Balfour and his minions"), in performing this act of justice to the Catholics of Armagh, are handing over the *Standard's* party "body and soul *to those who would destroy us.*" Compare the similar language published in the Australian Orange press, as quoted on pp. 165-167.

[23] In a letter written in 1895 to Canon Brosnan, the Protestant Rector of Cachirciveen (Kerry) says: "I take this opportunity of saying, with much gratitude, that during my long residence of twenty-eight years among them, I have received nothing but unvarying respect and kindness from your flock; and I shall never forget how, on two occasions, when laid low on a bed of illness, you and they acted towards me." Kerry is one of the most Catholic counties in Ireland. The *Daily News*, commenting on the Rector's letter, remarks that "it has often been pointed out that while Protestants and Roman Catholics squabble in the North-east of Ireland, *where the Catholics are in a minority*, they are generally on the best of terms in the South, *where they are in a majority.*"

—Catholic constituencies returned Protestant representatives to Parliament. At the general election of 1832, no fewer than 43 Protestant Members of Parliament were returned by thirty-three electorates in which the Catholics were in an overwhelming majority. In 1848, after the agonies of the great famine, Catholic electors returned 40 Protestant representatives to Parliament. They acted in a similar manner in the by-elections from 1848 to 1868—Mr. Ball, a Catholic, being, for instance, rejected by his co-religionists of Limerick in favour of a Protestant merchant, Mr. James Spaight. In 1868, Catholic majorities in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught returned 33 Protestants to Parliament. In 1874 the Home Rule question was brought before the Irish electors by Mr. Isaac Butt. The number of non-Catholic candidates decreased ; but every one of them who advocated the national demand was received with open arms. At the close of the contest, 28 Protestants represented Catholic constituencies in the British Parliament. Moreover, the chosen leaders of the Irish Catholic people were, almost to a man, Protestants, who had been returned for Catholic constituencies. Isaac Butt and Charles Stewart Parnell were members of the Protestant Episcopal Church; Joseph Biggar, when returned for Cavan, William Shaw, the elect of "rebel Cork," and John Martin, the choice of Meath, were Presbyterians.

(b) Municipal Honours.—It was not until 1841 that the Catholic Corporations of Ireland became possessed of political power. Since that time Catholic Galway has repeatedly had Protestant chairmen of its Commissioners, Protestant chairmen of the Harbour Board, etc. From the passing of the *Municipal Reform Act* of 1845 to 1886, Catholic Waterford has, on no fewer than *twelve* occasions, elected Protestants to the office of mayor. In 1891 its population was 18,810 Catholics, and 2,042 Protestants. From the Reform Act of 1841 to 1886, Limerick has had 13 non-Catholic mayors, and ever since Irish Corporations received the power to elect sheriffs, it has appointed Protestants to that office. The same is true of Cork, which has a population of 64,561 Catholics and 10,784 Protestants. Up to 1885 the Catholic Corporators placed eight Protestants on the Harbour Board, and at least seven more in the mayoral chair. In Dublin[24]

[24] In 1842, after the passing of the *Municipal Reform Act*, O'Connell offered one-half of the seats in the Dublin Corporation, *without a contest*, to the Protestant minority. From 1841 till 1869 the office of Lord Mayor was held, every alternate year, by a Protestant, and the Tory Corporators were allowed to elect their candidate. The nomination of Mr. Vokes Mackey for the office in 1869 led the (London) *Globe* to assert that the

there are 201,418 Catholics and 43,583 Protestants. Between 1841 and 1886, its Catholic Corporation elected no fewer than 18 Protestants to the office of Lord Mayor, and appointed many others of the creed of the minority to the office of sheriff.

2. *Offices of Emolument.*—In Catholic Galway, Drogheda, Sligo, Wexford, Waterford, and Limerick, a large proportion of the paid officials of the various elective bodies are Protestants. Up till a recent period (says Mr. Dawson) "all the Municipal chief offices in Cork, except that of Town Clerk, were held by non-Catholics, and they received £1,840 out of the £2,440 voted by the Catholic Council.[25] They form less than 15 per cent. of the population; they receive more than 75 per cent. of the salaries of the Corporation." In Sligo the Protestants are less than 21 per cent. of the population; they receive over 50 per cent. of the Municipal salaries. In Dublin, up to the appearance of Mr. Dawson's pamphlet in 1886, a great proportion of the officials of the Corporation were Protestants, who drew £4,000 out of £8,400 a year paid in salaries by the city fathers. Protestants form 18 per cent. of the population of Dublin; they drew over 47 per cent. of the amount paid by the city in salaries. When Mr. Langdale (a Catholic) was appointed sheriff of Fermanagh, he nominated as his sub-sheriff the Master of an Orange lodge.[26]

In the matter of the expression of sectarian feeling, a wide gulf is fixed between the portions of Ireland where Catholic majorities hold sway, and the North-East corner which is infected with the spirit of the Orange lodges. It would probably be difficult, perhaps impossible, to find in any country similarly circumstanced, such fair and broad-minded treatment accorded to minorities as that which Catholic majorities in elective bodies in Ireland extend to their Protestant fellow-countrymen.

Catholic Corporation of Dublin was opposed to Mr. Gladstone's proposal to disestablish the Protestant Church in Ireland. Mr. Mackey's imprudent friends re-echoed the assertion from pulpit and platform, with the result that the nomination was rescinded. Under the old arrangement Liberal Protestants were excluded from the Lord Mayoralty. Since 1869 the Catholic Corporators have elected Liberal, as well as Tory, Protestants to the office.

[25] In 1854 the powers of the Grand Jury and Wide Street Commissioners were transferred to the Corporation, who could have dismissed the mostly or altogether Protestant employés of the defunct bodies on small pensions. Instead, the Cork Corporation retained their services, and in several cases increased their salaries, one from £111 to £220 a year, another from £40 to £100 a year. A new office, that of City Engineer was created. A Protestant and a Catholic competed. The Protestant, in consideration of a previous claim, was appointed.

[26] Hansard, March 14, 1870, p. 1886.

Appendix B.

RITUAL OF INTRODUCTION TO THE ORANGE DEGREE.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

A BOOK on the Orange society, by anybody but an Orangeman, must, by the necessities of the case, deal chiefly with (*a*) matters which the institution intends or permits to come to the knowledge of the uninitiated; (*b*) with matters which become so known beside, or in spite of, the wishes of the society; and (*c*) with the known or traceable results of its activities. But beside and beyond these classes of facts there lies what is, for the general public, a great *terra incognita*: the inner life of the lodges. Herein mere private inquiry can avail very little, where secrecy is guarded by such fearful sanctions—frequently by dogged silence, and on occasion, as the reader has seen, by rank perjury—against even the most searching forms of judicial and Parliamentary inquiry. The reader will understand the severe limitations which were thus placed upon me in dealing with matters relating to the organisation, etc., of the Orange society, in chapters vi. and vii. In the course of the sixth chapter[1] evidence has been adduced to show that the *printed* rules and rituals of the Orange society are, at best, but half truths. They give quite an inadequate idea of the ceremonies, customs, and organisation of the lodges. Since the sixth and seventh chapters went through the press, I find that the number of inner rings, or wheels within wheels, of the society, is far greater than originally stated by me, or than appears in any printed lodge document or other authorities consulted by me when preparing this book for the press. The reader is already aware that Orangemen and Purplemen meet to transact business in the same lodges, and that the Purplemen have different secrets, signs, passwords, oaths or "obligations," etc., which they are not permitted to divulge to those of the lower degree.[2] When "Purple business" is

[1] Pp. 109 *sqq.*

[2] See pp. 107-108, *supra*. The Purpleman's emblems are, if I am rightly informed, a five-pointed star ✶ and the following mark)I(

about to be transacted—or, to use the technical phrase, when the lodge is to be "raised to the Royal Arch Purple [R.A.P.] degree"—the mere Orangemen are required to take themselves out of the room, and the lodge is cautiously "tyled" against prying eyes and ears before the proceedings are commenced.[3] Above the Purple order there are various "higher degrees." Tried Purplemen are eligible for membership of the lodges of the Royal Black Preceptory.[4] These lodges are numbered differently from the ordinary Orange lodges. Their meetings are held apart from those of Orangemen and Purplemen, and at different times or places. All mere members of the two lower degrees are severely excluded from presence at, or participation in, the special business of the Preceptory. It is a significant fact that the offices of the Provincial Grand Black Chapter of Victoria are filled altogether or almost altogether by members of the Grand Orange Lodge of the colony.[5] I cannot state with certainty the number of rings or degrees which meet in the Black Preceptory lodges; but as far as I have been able to discover, they run somewhat as follows:

Black Preceptory; Scarlet; White; Royal Blue, and (I think) Apron and Blue; Green; Link and Chain; Crimson Arrow; Red Cross.

As far as I have been able to learn, each of these degrees has its special colors,[6] emblems,[7] oaths, and secrets, which are to be jealously kept from the knowledge of the uninitiated.

As in the ordinary Orange lodges, the Black Preceptory meetings are frequently "raised" to one or other of the higher degrees. All members of lower degrees are then excluded, so

---

Each of these symbols has a special meaning, which must not be divulged to mere Orangemen. Members of the Orange degree wear only the colours of their order (orange), and have no special symbol that I know of. Compare rule 22, Appendix C.

[3] The *Victorian Standard* reports refer with great frequency to the raising of the lodge to the R.A.P. degree, but, of course, no hint is ever given of what takes place when the Purplemen meet in secret conclave.

[4] The *Victorian Standard* occasionally records the admission of Purplemen into the R.B.P. lodges. See, for instance, its issue of December 31, 1896, p. 11.

[5] *Victorian Standard*, November 30, 1896, pp. 10-11. The same statement holds good, to a great extent, with regard to the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society. See p. 5, *supra*.

[6] An Orange rosette or badge in the writer's possession has the following colours in the order here stated; Orange, purple, black, scarlet, white alternating with black, blue, white, and last, of all the colours of the rainbow, *green*. The whole is surmounted by a metallic five-pointed star.

[7] The emblem of the Black Preceptory is the cheerful one of a skull and crossbones; that of the Apron and Royal Blue is, I think, a compass and square; and that of green, a rake, pickaxe, and shovel. There are also a rule, triangle, crimson arrow, and other emblems, each having a

that the special secrets of the inner rings may never percolate to the outside circle of the association.[8]

Elaborate precautions are taken to prevent the rituals, "lectures," or "instructions" of the "higher degrees" from falling into the hands even of members of the lower orders. I have been credibly informed that the "lectures" from the Purple degree upwards exist in manuscript only, and that they are placed in the hands of only a very limited number of persons—the lecture-masters, I fancy;—that they contain formal oaths; and that they one and all breathe a spirit of deep hostility to Catholics.[9] Some time ago the *Victorian Standard* contained a suggestion—made probably in the interests of secrecy—that the "lectures" should not be read, as is the usual custom, but delivered from memory. As far as I can learn, the only initiatory ceremonial of the Orange society that has been committed to the risk of print is that of the Orange degree, which is given hereunder.

RITUAL OF THE ORANGE DEGREE.[10]

[THE applicant will be introduced between two Sponsors—namely, the Brethren who proposed and seconded his admission—carrying the Bible in his hands with the Book of Rules and Regulations placed thereon. Two Brethren shall precede him on his entering the room. A Chaplain, if present, or, in his

meaning of its own, which is not to be communicated to a member of any lower degree.

[8]Only three or four of the Black Preceptory lodges of Victoria advertise or are reported in the *Victorian Standard*. They all meet in the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, the head-quarters of the Orange institution of the colony. One Black Preceptory lodge in Perth (W.A.) advertises in the *Victorian Standard*.

[9]From what I have been able to learn, these "lectures" and "instructions" form a curious blending of Scripture, politics, hatred of Catholics, and elaborate explanations of recondite signs, emblems, etc. I have been informed that, for instance, certain references to the sun, moon, and stars are worked out with considerable elaboration in the "lecture" for the Purple degree.

[10]The full title, etc., runs as follows: *Ritual of Introduction to the Orange Degree, with opening and closing Prayer. Melbourne: Stewart and Woodman, General Printers, 13 and 14 Eastern Market, Lower Flat.* No date. This is the *Ritual* now (1897) in use in the lodges of Victoria. With trifling exceptions, it is the same as the one in use in Orange lodges in 1799 and 1800. The reader will note the strange combination it presents of religion, conditional loyalty, electioneering, secrecy at all costs, active animosity against Catholics, and needless protestations to comply with certain elemental civic duties which are already enforced by law and conscience, and which are quietly performed, as a mere matter of course, by all ordinary adult males, except criminals and misdemeanants. One, and only one, ritual is supplied to each lodge. Like the seals, it remains the property of the Grand Lodge, and may be withdrawn at any time. See rules 26, 28.

absence, a Brother appointed by the Master, shall say the whole or part of what follows]:

Chaplain: "Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord, or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation." *Psalm* xxiv., 3-5.

[*During the reading of this the candidate shall stand at the foot of the table, the Brethren all standing also in their places*].[11]

Master: Friend, is it of your own free will and accord that you seek admission into the Orange Institution?

Candidate: It is.

Master: Who will answer for this friend, that he is a true Protestant[12] and a loyal subject?[13]

[*The Sponsors shall bow to the Master and signify the same, each mentioning his own name*].

Master: Have you duly considered the responsibility you have incurred to the Institution at large, and this Lodge in particular, in thus becoming a guarantee to us for this friend?

Sponsors: We have.

Master: It is required of you, in order to be a true Orangeman, that you shall be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen; that you shall support and maintain to the utmost of your power the Laws and Constitution of Great Britain and her colonies, and the rightful succession to the Throne in Her Majesty's illustrious house, *being Protestant*,[14] and that you shall always be ready and willing to aid and assist, when called upon, the Magistrates and Civil Authorities in the lawful execution of their duties.[15]

Chaplain: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is not power but the powers that are

---

[11] With the exception of these and the following rubrical directions, and the words "William the Third" in the "obligation," the italics and capitals are the present writer's.

[12] The words "*true* Protestants," "Protestants who are *in earnest*," etc., mean those who are prepared to adopt an aggressive attitude towards Catholics. Cf. pp. 92, *sqq.*, 265, *supra*.

[13] For loyalty, as understood in the lodges, see chaps. x.-xv., *supra*.

[14] For the words of the old Orange oath of conditional loyalty, see p. 252, *supra*. The reader will note the condition here attached to the loyalty of the brethren. See details of the Cumberland conspiracy, chap. xv., *supra*.

[15] Orangemen bind themselves to two kinds of "obligations": (1) Those to which all law-abiding citizens are already bound both by law and conscience; (2) those which are special to Orangemen, and which have a decided flavour of disloyalty. See pp. 247 *sqq.*, *supra*. For the manner in which the brethren "aid the civil authorities," see pp. 201-240, *supra*.

ordained of God; for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same. Wherefore ye must needs be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." *Romans* xiii., 1, 2, 3.

Master: Friend, it is required of you that you avoid, discountenance, and repudiate all Societies and Associations which are composed of persons who seek to subvert the just prerogative of the Crown,[16] the established rights of property,[17] and the connection of these colonies with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.[18]

Chaplain: "If sinners entice thee, consent thou not. If they say, Come with us, let us lay wait for blood, let us lurk privily for the innocent without cause; we shall find all precious substance, we shall fill our houses with spoil; cast in thy lot amongst us, let us all have one purse. My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path; for their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood." *Prov.* i., 10-16.

Master: Friend, it is required of you that you be true and faithful to every brother Orangeman in all just actions, and never know him to be wronged without giving him due notice thereof. *And it is also required of you that, should you now or at any future period be in the possession of the electoral franchise, you will support by your vote and interest* ORANGE AND PROTESTANT CANDIDATES ONLY, *and in no wise refrain from voting, remembering our*

---

[16]Orangemen and the prerogative of the Crown: see the Cumberland conspiracy, chap. xv.

[17]Orangemen and the rights of property, etc.: see pp. 71 *sqq.*, 221 *sqq.*, 268; cf. p. 162.

[18]In Ireland the Orange party are, by their rules, pledged to maintain the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, the policy of the society in this, as in other matters, being dictated by the Grand Lodge leaders. In 1799, when Home Rule meant what Orangemen understood by the Protestant ascendency (see pp. 252-253) a large number of the Irish lodges were strongly opposed to the Act of Union of 1800. See Appendices to *Reports* of Irish Parliamentary Committee of 1835, also Barry O'Brien's *Thomas Drummond*, pp. 108-109. Mr. Bouverie-Pusey, a Protestant writer, states in his *Past History of Ireland* (p. 119) that the majority of the Orangemen were opposed to the Legislative Union. In 1869, after the passing of the Disestablishment Bill, many of the Orange leaders, in disgust at British "treachery," became for the nonce advocates of Home Rule. The Dublin Grand Lodge, in its printed proceedings for 1869, agreed to the postponement of a motion by Brother Nunn, with the understanding that they would, at a special meeting, "consider the subject of omitting the obligation to maintain the Legislative Union." Healy's *Word for Ireland*, p. 144. Many extracts from Orange speakers and writers, all pointing the same way, will be found in *The Orange Bogey*, by J. J. Clancy, M.P., Irish Press Agency, London, 1886.

motto: "*He who is not with us is against us.*" "*Your neglecting to fulfil these conditions will render you* LIABLE TO EXPULSION."[19]

Chaplain: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another." *John* xiii. 34. "And this commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God, loveth his brother also." *I. John* iv., 21. "I will not be ashamed to defend a friend, neither will I hide myself from him; and if any evil happen unto me by him, every man that heareth it will be aware of him."

Master: Friend, if it is not your determination to perform the duty and fulfil the expectation that I have now laid before you, you are at liberty to withdraw, rather than *bring disgrace on your proposer, dishonour and expulsion on yourself*, discredit on the Institution, and consequent injury to the cause we espouse. Friend, what do you carry in your hand?

Candidate: The Word of God.

Master: Under the assurance of your worthy Brothers who introduced you, we will trust that you also carry it in your own heart. What is that other Book?

Candidate: The Book of Rules and Regulations.

Master: With the like assurance we will further trust that you will study them well, and obey them in all lawful matters. Therefore, we gladly receive you into our Institution. Brethren, bring forward your friend.

[*The candidate shall then be brought to the right hand of the Master, when he shall kneel down and take the following obligation*]:[20]

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen Victoria; that I will to the utmost of my power support and maintain the Protestant Religion and the succession to the Throne in Her Majesty's illustrious house *being Protestant*,[21] and that I will ever hold sacred the name of our glorious deliverer WILLIAM THE THIRD, Prince of Orange; that I am not, nor never was, and never will be, a Roman Catholic, and that I am not married to one, nor will I marry one, or willingly permit any child of mine to marry one;[22] that I am not, nor

[19] See *note* 15, *supra*, and pp. 132-139.

[20] The candidate takes this "obligation" on his knees, *holding the Bible in his hands*. The English Parliamentary Committee stated that it has "the apparent obligation of an oath." See p. 115. Instances have been given in which *formal oaths* were taken on initiation, although such oaths are not, for evident reasons, provided for in the *printed* rituals. See pp. 111-112. A statement has been made to the writer that, at initiation, the Orangeman receives directions couched in some such terms as the following: "and, to make this obligation more binding, you will now kiss the book."

[21] See *note* 14, *supra*.

[22] See pp. 85, 96-98, *supra*.

ever was, nor ever will become, a member of any treasonable society or body of men who are enemies to the lawful Sovereign[23] or the Protestant religion, and that I never took oath of secrecy to any treasonable society; that I will, as far as in me lies, assist magistrates and civil authorities of the colonies in the lawful execution of their duties, *when called upon to do so*;[24] that I will be true and faithful to every Brother Orangeman in all just actions, that I will not wrong, nor know him to be wronged or injured, without giving him due notice thereof, if in my power so to do; and that *I will not in* ANY *manner communicate or reveal, by word, act, or deed,* ANY *of the proceedings of any Brother Orangeman in Lodge assembled, nor* ANY *matter or thing therein communicated to me, unless to a Brother Orangeman, well knowing him to be such, or until I shall have been authorised so to do by the Grand Lodge*;[25] that I have not, to my knowledge or belief, been proposed in and rejected by, nor suspended or expelled from, any other Orange Lodge;[26] and that I now become an Orangeman without fear, bribery, or corruption, steadfastly resolving, by God's help, to observe and abide by ALL *rules*[27] made for the government of the Orange Institution in Victoria.

Chaplain: "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle, not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you

---

[23] See *notes* 15, 16, *supra*.

[24] See pp. 247-249, *supra*.

[25] The reader will note the sweeping character of this part of the "solemn declaration" (or oath) which the Grand Lodge requires every Orangeman to take on bended knees, holding the Bible in his hands. By virtue of the wording of this "obligation," or oath, every member of the Orange society binds himself as follows: that, even when examined in courts of justice, etc., regarding lodge proceedings, he will either be guilty of contempt of court by declining to give evidence, or will commit perjury, unless the Grand Lodge graciously accords him, under seal, written permission to tell the plain truth. See pp. 114, 120. Such permission is very rarely granted. We have seen above (p. 115) that if, without such permission, he gives true and faithful evidence on such matters, as any loyal citizen should, he would, as the English Parliamentary Committee declared, be expelled from the society. For instances of refusal to give evidence on lodge matters, see Preface, and pp. 110-112, 115, 123-124. An instance in which the Grand Lodge passed a vote of thanks to a recalcitrant witness is given on pp. 108-109. Instances of prevarication by Orange witnesses in high places will be found in chap. xv., 352-354. Cf. p. 110.

[26] See p. 129, *supra*.

[27] See p. 136, *supra*.

the whole armour of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day." *Ephes.* vi., 10-13.

Master: We receive thee, dear Brother, into the Religious and Loyal Institution of Orangemen, trusting that thou wilt abide a devoted servant of God, and a true believer in His Son Jesus Christ, a faithful subject to our Queen, and supporter of our Constitution. Keep thou firm in the Protestant faith, holding its pure doctrine, and observing its holy precepts,[28] make thyself the friend of all pious and peaceful men, *avoiding strife, and seeking benevolence; slow to take offence, and offering none*,[29] thereby, so far as in thee lieth, turning the injustice of our adversaries into their own reproof and confusion.

[*Here the Master shall invest the newly made Brother with the Insignia of the Order, and then raise him by the hand, which he will hold while he repeats*] In the name of the Brotherhood, I bid thee welcome, and pray that thou mayest long continue amongst them a worthy Orangeman—namely, fearing God, honouring the Queen and maintaining the Law.

OBLIGATIONS FOR OFFICERS.

I, A.B., do solemnly and sincerely declare—*Master and Deputy Master:* That I am not now made a Master (or Deputy Master) for any private emolument or advantage; that I have not a sitting in my house for which I hold a license to sell beer, spirits, or any other intoxicating liquor;[30] that I will not knowingly admit, or allow any person for me to admit, any-one into the Society of Orangemen who was or is a Papist;[31] that I will use my authority to keep proper behaviour and sobriety in this lodge; and that I will not certify for any

[28] See pp. 102-103 for some verdicts as to "the baneful and unchristian influence" of the lodges. In this connection it is a singular fact that, among a people living in practically the same conditions, the lodge-ridden portions of Ulster are those which furnish the highest percentage of illegitimate births. A Protestant writer, Mr. J. A. Fox, has the following remarks on this subject: "Ulster, it is sad to tell, is *primus* amongst the Irish provinces in immorality only; Antrim, Armagh, Londonderry, Down, and Tyrone counties being the plague spots of the most moral country in Europe. These counties, the *Pall Mall Gazette* says, are the only ones 'returning Orange members to the present Parliament,' and, somewhat unkindly, adds: 'It seems that Orangeism and illegitimacy go together, and that illegitimate children in Ireland are in proportion to Orange lodges.'" (*A Key to the Irish Question*, p. 166. Kegan Paul: 1890). See the Registrar-General's returns in the Census of 1891; also Dr. Leffingwell's work on *Illegitimacy*, pp. 26-28, 29, 153. (Swan Sonnenschein: 1892). The rate of illegitimacy in Down is constantly almost ten times greater than for Mayo (*ibid.*, p. 28).

[29] The comment on these words will be found in chaps iv., viii., x., xi., xiii., xiv.

[30] See pp. 115-116.

[31] See pp. 83 *sqq.*, 106.

person without having first proved him, and being satisfied in my conscience that he is a person of good character.

Secretary: That I will, to the utmost of my power, keep safe the papers belonging to this Lodge, and that I will not give any copy of the Articles, or lend them, to make an Orangeman out of the Lodge I belong to,[32] or lend the Seal, so that it may be affixed to any forged paper or irregular Orangeman's Certificate.

Treasurer: That I will account for all money I have or may receive for the use of this lodge, when called upon by the Master of this Lodge.

Committee Men: That whenever I may be called upon to act, in the absence of the Master and Deputy Master, I will not knowingly admit anyone into the Society of Orangemen who was or is a Papist; and that I will use my authority to keep proper behaviour and sobriety in the Lodge.

TYLER'S RITUAL.

OBLIGATION.

I, A.B., do solemnly declare that I will be faithful to the duties of my office, and *I will not admit any person into the Lodge without having first found him to be in possession of the Financial Password*,[33] or without sanction of the W.M. of this Lodge.

DUTIES OF TYLERS.

The duty devolves on the D.M. in seeing that the Lodge is properly tyled, who, when directed to do so by the W.M., shall address the Tyler thus: Worthy Tyler, what is your duty to this Lodge? To which the Tyler shall reply thus: To prevent the intrusion of improper persons into the Lodge, to take the names and passwords from Brothers previous to admitting them, and to obey the commands of the W.M. in the admission of Brothers and Candidates for Membership into the Lodge.

[Here follow an opening and a closing prayer. Neither of them contains anything noteworthy, with, perhaps, the exception of the following petition from the closing prayer: "Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord, and enable us to lead a quiet and peaceful life in all godliness and honesty.]"[34]

---

[32] See *note* 10, *supra* and p. 119.

[33] Secret signs, passwords, etc., see pp. 108-112, *supra*.

[34] Chaps. viii.-xiv. form a sufficient commentary on this invocation.

Appendix C.

RULES

OF THE

LOYAL ORANGE INSTITUTION OF VICTORIA.[1]

BASIS OF THE INSTITUTION.

THE Orange Institution, so named in honor of King William, Prince of Orange, is composed of Protestants resolved to support and defend to the utmost of their power the Protestant religion, the laws of the colony, the rightful Sovereign, being Protestant, and to maintain the connection of this colony with Great Britain and Ireland. It is exclusively an association of those who are attached to the religion of the Reformation, and will not admit into its Brotherhood persons whom an intolerant spirit leads to persecute, injure, or upbraid any man on account of his religious opinions.

GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS.

The Master and Members of any Lodge in which a Candidate is proposed, must satisfy themselves, previous to his admission, that he possesses the following qualifications:

An Orangeman should have a sincere love and veneration for the Triune God—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; an humble and steadfast faith in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, believing him to be God and man, and the only Mediator between God and man. He should cultivate truth and justice, brotherly kindness, charity, devotion, piety, concord, unity, and obedience to the laws; his deportment should be gentle, compassionate, kind, and courteous; he should cultivate the society of the virtuous, and avoid the company of the evil; he should honor and diligently read the Holy Scriptures, and make them the rule of his faith and practice; he should love, uphold, and defend the Protestant Religion, and sincerely desire and endeavour to propagate its doctrines and precepts; he should strenuously oppose the fatal errors and doctrines of the Church of Rome, and scrupulously

[1] The full title of the pamphlet is given on p. 85, *supra*, *note* 4. The original rules have very few punctuation marks. The ordinary system of punctuation, which was carried out in the rules of 1878, 1885, and 1891, is introduced here for the reader's convenience, care being taken that in no case the sense of any rule, or part of any rule, is thereby altered.

avoid countenancing, by his presence or otherwise, any act or ceremony of Roman Catholic worship; he should by all lawful means resist the ascendency of that Church, its encroachments, and the extension of its power, ever abstaining from all uncharitable words, actions, or sentiments towards its adherents; he should remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day and attend the public worship of God, and diligently train up his offspring, and all under his control, in the fear of God and in the Protestant faith; he should never take the name of God in vain, but abstain from all profane language, and use every opportunity of discouraging these and all other sinful practices in others; his conduct should be guided by wisdom and prudence and marked by honesty, temperance and sobriety. The glory of God, the welfare of man, the honour of his Sovereign, and the good of his country, should be the motives of his actions.

ADMISSION OF MEMBERS.

1. The admission of members shall be by ballot, one black ball in seven to exclude. No candidate shall be balloted for without having been regularly proposed and seconded in open Lodge at least one month previous to such ballot. No candidate who has been rejected can be re-balloted for in any Lodge, until after the expiration of twelve months from the date of such rejection, and then only by the special permission of the Grand Lodge. Any person who has been rejected by one Lodge and has obtained admission into another without informing the members of the fact, shall on proof thereof be expelled the Institution.

ROMAN CATHOLICS, PERSONS WHO HAVE BEEN.

2. No person who has at any time been a Roman Catholic, or has married one, shall be admitted into the Institution, except by the vote of the Grand Lodge (one vote in seven to exclude), founded upon testimonials of good character, and a certificate of his having been duly elected by ballot (pursuant to Rule 1) in the Lodge in which he is proposed, such certificate to be sent to the Grand Secretary. Any member marrying a Roman Catholic shall be expelled.

INITIATION FEE, SUBSCRIPTIONS, SUSPENSIONS.

3. Each member shall, previous to his admission into the Orange Institution, pay a sum of five shillings for the Orange Degree, and he shall pay such monthly subscriptions as the Lodge may require. Any member failing therein for six months shall be considered unfinancial, and shall be liable to suspension for a term not exceeding nine months, and, if all the subscriptions be not paid within that period, to a further

suspension not exceeding two years, and then, unless payment be made to the satisfaction of the Lodge, he shall be expelled, provided that the member suspended under this law shall have been served with a notice, by letter, to his last known address, to attend and show cause why he should not be so dealt with. Should any member desire to take the Purple Degree, he shall give notice to the Secretary of his Lodge, who shall duly propose him, and, if accepted, the candidate shall pay the sum of ten shillings for such Degree previcus to his admission.

REJECTIONS.

4. The rejection of any rejoining member, or of any candidate, shall be reported to the Grand Secretary, and when confirmed by the Grand Lodge, shall be inserted in the next Grand Lodge Report, and the consent of the Grand Lodge must be obtained before he can be admitted into any Lodge; and a rejoining member shall take the same obligation as a candidate.

REJOINING MEMBERS.

5. Any member of the Institution the Warrant of whose Lodge has been surrendered or cancelled, may, with the consent of the Grand Lodge, be received as a rejoining member by any other Lodge, on the payment of two shillings and sixpence; a ballot to be taken for his admission.

SUSPENDED MEMBERS REJOINING.

6. A member notified as being suspended for non-payment of dues, and the same appearing in the Annual Report, shall not be received into his Lodge until the sum of six shillings has been paid.

MEMBERS TO BELONG TO PRIVATE LODGE; TO BE FINANCIAL; FOUNDATION MEMBERS OF NEW LODGES.

7. Every member of the Institution shall belong to a Private Lodge, and may also, on payment of 5s. a year, be an affiliated member of another Lodge, with all the privileges of membership, except those voting for, or becoming a delegate to, the Grand Lodge. For the establishment of a new Lodge, he may become a Foundation Member of the same for a period of 12 months, and, should he desire to remain a member thereof, he shall draw his clearance from his old Lodge. No one who is not a financial member of a Lodge shall take any part in the business thereof, or hold any office therein.

RE-BALLOT, GRAND LODGE CAN ORDER.

8. In order to guard the Institution against the possibility

of improper persons continuing members thereof, it shall be competent for the Grand Lodge, upon the application of a Private Lodge, to order a re-ballot for any member or members thereof; and should it be deemed expedient that all or any members of the Institution should undergo a new ballot, a re-ballot shall be taken in such a manner as the Grand Lodge shall prescribe. Any member being rejected can only be re-admitted into the Institution with the sanction of the Grand Lodge, after notice to the Lodge by which such member was rejected.

RESIGNATIONS.

9. After a member has resigned membership, he shall not be permitted to rejoin the Institution unless approved of by the Lodge from which he has resigned, and sanctioned by the Grand Lodge.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST MEMBERS.

10. Complaints or charges against members must in the first place be dealt with in their Private Lodges, or by the committee thereof, and confirmed by the Lodge, unless such cases as the Grand Lodge shall see fit to have tried otherwise; and ten days previously the charge must be furnished in writing to the member complained of, and to the Secretary of the Lodge in which the case is to be tried.

TRIALS.

11. Before entering upon the trial or investigation of any charge against a Lodge, the warrant of such Lodge shall be deposited in the custody of the officer presiding at such trial or investigation.

LODGES REFUSING TO TRY.

12. In case any Private Lodge neglect or refuse to try and decide any charge or complaint that may be preferred against any member thereof, such member shall be summoned before the Lodge to which the aggrieved member belongs, which Lodge shall have the power to try and decide thereon, subject to the appeal to the Grand Lodge.

BREACH OF LAWS.

13. In case of misconduct in a Lodge, or any breach of the Laws of the Institution, or any action inconsistent with the principles of the Institution, the punishment shall be suspension, not exceeding a period of seven years.

OFFENCES.

14. Any member guilty of an offence of an aggravated

character against religion or morality, or of habitual drunkenness, shall be liable to expulsion.

APPEALS.

15. Any one who may feel aggrieved at the decision of any Lodge officer of a Lodge or Committee, shall have the power of appealing to the next highest jurisdiction; but in any case where a fine has been inflicted, such fine must be first fully paid, and, in the event of the appeal being sustained, it shall be returned to the party paying it. In all cases of appeal to the Grand Lodge, the sum of one guinea shall be deposited with the Grand Secretary; also two written notices of the grounds of appeal, one of which notices shall be forwarded by the Grand Secretary to the party or parties whose decision has been appealed against, three days before the hearing of such appeal; and the party or parties so appealed against shall thereupon produce all evidence taken before them in the case to the body trying such appeal. The one guinea so deposited shall be dealt with as the body adjudicating the case may deem fit.

CANDIDATES FOR PURPLE DEGREE, WHEN ELIGIBLE.

16. No candidate shall be eligible to receive the Purple Degree without the consent of his Lodge, after attending six monthly meetings, except by the permission of the Grand Lodge.

LODGES NOT TO BE HELD IN HOTELS.

17. No Lodge shall be held in a Hotel, unless a suitable room cannot be obtained elsewhere, and then only with the approval of the Grand Lodge.

DOCUMENTS, ETC

18. All documents necessary to the working of the Institution, including rule-books, rituals, warrants, certificates, and all other forms, shall be printed exclusively under the directions of the Grand Lodge; and no Private Lodge or member shall present to any person or body, or publish or print any address or other documents, or be a party to any act, which may in any way involve the Institution, or any members thereof as such, without the sanction of the Grand Lodge. Any member violating this rule shall be liable to expulsion.

BOOKS OPEN FOR INSPECTION.

19. The books and documents of all Lodges of the Institution shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of its members, the Grand Lodge officers, and persons properly authorised on behalf of the Government of the country.

RETURNS, LODGES TO FURNISH SAME.

20. Any Private Lodge neglecting to furnish such returns, or to pay such dues, as may be required by the Grand Lodge, seven days at least before the meeting of the Grand Lodge in November, shall be liable to pay a fine of ten shillings; and the representatives of such Lodge shall be disqualified from sitting in the Grand Lodge, except on payment of the dues and fine, and on the vote of the Grand Lodge.

NAME OF LODGES.

21. No Lodge shall assume any distinctive title or name, without the permission of the Grand Lodge.

EMBLEMS TO BE WORN.

22. At all meetings of the Grand Lodge or Private Lodges, members shall wear appropriate emblems of the order or degree they have received; but in no case shall they be permitted to wear any colour or emblem which has not been duly conferred on them by the authority of the Orange Institution; and those of the Orange degree shall wear the Orange colour only, which shall be provided by the Lodge.

BUSINESS TRANSACTED WHILE LODGE IS OPEN.

23. No business shall be transacted except while the Lodge is regularly open, and no refreshments shall be permitted during that period.

DECISIONS OF MAJORITY, ETC.

24. In all meetings of Lodges and Committees, the decision of the majority of qualified members present shall be binding on the minority, and upon all members and Lodges subordinate thereto; and besides his ordinary vote as a member, the presiding officer or Chairman shall, in every case of an equality of votes, be entitled to a second or casting vote. Any member voting in the minority shall be privileged to call for a division.

CELEBRATIONS.

25. In order to commemorate GOD'S gracious deliverance of the Protestant Parliament from the intended massacre by gunpowder, and the happy arrival on that day of His Majesty KING WILLIAM III. for the deliverance of the nation, the members shall celebrate the 5th of November. They shall in like manner commemorate the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne on the 12th July.

WARRANTS ETC., PROPERTY OF GRAND LODGE.

26. All Warrants, Seals, and Rituals, issued to Lodges, are the property of the Grand Lodge, which has the power of

cancelling, suspending, or withdrawing any Warrant as it may see fit, and of again issuing the same to any other Lodge; but on all such re-issues of Warrants, the charge shall be 10s. 6d.; and the Grand Master shall have full power to suspend, take, or authorise possession to be taken of, any warrant, subject to appeal to the Grand Lodge; and every Warrant while so cancelled, suspended, or withdrawn, shall be wholly void and inoperative, and every member who shall knowingly use, or act upon, or sit under, any such Warrant during such period, shall be suspended for a term not exceeding two years.

LODGES TO BE HELD UNDER WARRANT.

27. No Lodge shall be held without the authority of a Warrant, under the seal of the Grand Lodge of Victoria, signed by the G.M., D.G.M., Grand Secretary, and Grand Treasurer; and all Warrants shall be held by the Officers for the time being of the Lodge, in trust, subject to the Laws of the Institution.

WARRANTS NOT TO BE REMOVED.

28. No Warrant, Seal, or Ritual, shall be bought, sold, or removed from the district for which it was granted, without the authority of the Grand Lodge; and any member buying, selling, or removing, any warrant, shall be suspended for any term not exceeding twelve months, and then, unless he shall have surrendered such Warrant, Seal, or Ritual to the Grand Secretary, he may be expelled.

PROPERTY OF LODGES.

29. All goods, books, money, chattels, and effects of any Lodge shall be placed in the custody of the officers, who shall be accountable for the same; and if any member damage, destroy, or take away the Warrant, regalia, money, deeds, or other property of the Lodge, he shall be expelled, or otherwise punished, as the Lodge may determine.

SPECIAL MEETINGS.

30. Lodges shall hold special meetings when requested by the Grand Lodge, and shall consider and deal with such business as may be required of them.

MAKING AND ALTERATION OF LAWS.

31. The Grand Lodge shall have the power of making such alterations in, and additions to, the Laws, as may from time to time be found necessary, six months' notice of the proposed alteration being first given; but no Law of the Institution, or resolution of the Grand Lodge, which, in the opinion of the Chairman for the time being, has the effect of a Law, shall be

altered or rescinded without such notice, and two-thirds of the members present concurring in such alterations.

GRAND LODGE.

CONSTITUTION OF GRAND LODGE.

32. The affairs of the Institution shall be managed by the Grand Lodge, which shall consist of the Grand Master, Immediate Past Grand Master, seven Deputy Grand Masters, Grand Chaplain, Grand Secretary, Grand Treasurer, nine members of Grand Committee, and the Managing Committee of the Melbourne Protestant Hall, together with the Representatives of the Private Lodges elected from the Purple Members thereof in the ratio of one for each twenty-five members or portion thereof.

DEPUTY GRAND MASTERS.

33. The seven Deputy Grand Masters mentioned in Rule No. 32 shall be appointed for the following districts and shall be members of Lodges within such districts, viz.: (1) Melbourne and Metropolitan District; (2) Ballarat and Western District; (3) Castlemaine, Sandhurst, and Northern District; (4) North-Eastern District; (5) Geelong and South-Western District; (6) Gippsland District; (7) Wimmera District.

PROTESTANT HALL COMMITTEE.

34. The Grand Lodge shall, immediately after the election of Grand Officers, proceed to elect seven members to act as a Managing Committee for the Melbourne Protestant Hall, and the revenue accruing therefrom, such Committee to render a report and account of all their proceedings and transactions to the Grand Lodge at its November meeting.

GRAND COMMITTEE, DUTIES OF.

35. To the Grand Committee, of which the Grand Master, Deputy Grand Masters, Grand Chaplain, Grand Secretary, and Grand Treasurer, are *ex-officio* members, is delegated all the authority of the Grand Lodge during the intervals between its meetings, except the power of altering or rescinding any of its resolutions, or making any alteration in the Constitution and Laws of the Institution. This Committee shall prepare and arrange the business to be brought before the Grand Lodge from time to time, watch over its interests during such intervals, and carry into effect such objects and purposes, in strict accordance with the Rules, reporting all its proceedings to each meeting of the Grand Lodge for confirmation. It shall meet once each month at the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, or when

and where summoned by the Grand Secretary or Chairman, seven days' notice being previously given.

MEETINGS OF GRAND LODGE.

36. The Grand Lodge shall have not less than two regular meetings in each year, viz.: May and November, and each meeting shall be held at such place as shall be decided by the preceding meeting.

BUSINESS OF GRAND LODGE.

37. At each meeting of the Grand Lodge, the Grand Secretary shall first read and place on record the credentials of all delegates entitled to take their seats in the Grand Lodge. They shall then hear and determine all appeals, and confirm or reject, as the case may be, all the returns from the Private Lodges, and at the November meeting shall elect, from the members of the Purple Order entitled to be present, the Grand Officers and Committees for the ensuing year, such election to be by ballot, with a majority of the members present, and those elected shall be installed before the closing of such meeting.

SPECIAL MEETING OF GRAND LODGE.

38. The Grand Master, or, in his absence, one of the Deputy Grand Masters, may, on his own authority, or shall, on receipt of a requisition signed by ten members eligible to sit in the Grand Lodge, call a special meeting thereof, and such special meeting of the Grand Lodge shall have the right to exercise all the powers of a regular meeting.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETINGS.

39. No special meeting of the Grand Lodge shall be held without fourteen days' notice of the business which is to come before it having been first given to all its members; and in order to constitute such meetings, 30 members must be present. All notices to be inserted in the business sheet of the annual meeting must be deposited with the Grand Secretary sixty clear days prior to Grand Lodge meeting.

VISITORS.

40. The Grand Lodge shall have power of admitting to its meetings visitors who are duly vouched for financial members of the Purple Degree.

TRUSTEES, REAL PROPERTY TO BE VESTED IN.

41. All the real property of the Institution shall be vested in five Trustees, members of the Institution, appointed by, and holding office during the pleasure of, the Grand Lodge,

subject to the provisions of Part 3 of the Trusts Act, 1890, under which the Trust shall be duly registered.

TRUSTEES ABSENT FROM VICTORIA.

42. A Trustee absent from Victoria for the space of twelve months shall be deemed to have resigned office as Trustee, and the vacancy shall be filled by the Grand Lodge.

TRUSTEES AND OTHER PROPERTY.

43. All the other property of the Institution, and that of any Private Lodge passing a special resolution to that effect, shall be vested in three Trustees, members of the Institution, who shall be elected and shall remain in office during the pleasure of the Grand Lodge; and such Trustees are hereby empowered to sue for and recover, and to hold and apply the same to the use of the Lodge or Lodges to which the same may belong.

TRUSTEES SUBJECT TO CONTROL.

44. The Trustees shall hold the real property and effects invested in them subject to the direction and control of the Grand or Private Lodge entitled thereto, as declared by resolution passed by such Lodges respectively from time to time, and shall in all respects deal with and dispose thereof in accordance with such resolution.

LEVY.

45. The annual Grand Lodge levy shall be fixed at each November meeting for every member financial on the books of the Institution, and shall be payable to the Grand Secretary half-yearly on the 1st of March and the 1st day of September; and no delegate of any Lodge shall have the privilege of a member of the Grand Lodge until his Lodge shall have paid such levy.

REPORTS.

46. The Grand Lodge shall, within one month after its November meeting, issue a report of all its proceedings, and furnish copies to the members of the Institution, through the Secretaries of the private Lodges, such report to specify the name and numbers of the lodges, and names of all persons who may have resigned, been rejected, suspended, or expelled, giving the reason for such rejection, suspension, or expulsion, and period of such suspension, as the case may be.

ACCOUNTS TO BE AUDITED.

47. The accounts of the Grand Treasurer and Grand Secretary shall be audited, and a balance-sheet duly vouched shall be presented to the Grand Lodge meetings held in May

and November of each year, and entered in detail in published report; and in no case shall any officer retain more than £20 in his possession, the surplus to be vested in the names of the three Trustees of the Institution.

GRAND TREASURER, DUTIES OF.

48. The Grand Treasurer shall receive all moneys from the Grand Secretary, on behalf of the Institution. He shall not incur any liabilities, or contract any debt, or pay any moneys, without the authority of the Grand Lodge.

GRAND SECRETARY, DUTIES OF.

49. The Grand Secretary shall be Secretary to the Committees and Trustees appointed by the Grand Lodge. He shall receive all moneys of the Institution, and of the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, and hand them to the Treasurer entitled thereto, within fourteen days of the date he receives them. He shall also keep the books, and transact the business, of the Grand Lodge, and be the custodian of the seal of the Grand Lodge, and of all its books and papers. He shall produce all or any of such, when required by the Grand Master, or, in his absence, the Deputy Grand Master, or the Grand Lodge, or Grand Committee, and furnish all private Lodges with a business sheet at least thirty-five days before the regular Grand Lodge meetings. His address shall be the Protestant Hall, Melbourne.

WARRANTS, APPLICATIONS FOR.

50. On the application to the Grand Secretary for a Warrant to form a new Lodge, he shall enquire as to the suitability of the place of meeting, and report thereon to the Grand Committee. No application for a Warrant shall be entertained unless in writing, signed by not less than five members, three at least of the Purple Degree, stating the names of the proposed officers, the place and time of meeting, accompanied with the sum of one guinea to pay for the Warrant. To form a quorum, not less than five members shall be present, three to be of the Purple Degree. The Grand Master, with the Grand Secretary, may issue under seal a dispensation to form a Lodge until the next meeting of the Grand Committee.

GRAND LODGE OFFICERS MEMBERS OF PRIVATE LODGES.

51. All elective officers of the Grand Lodge are *ex officio* members of all Private Lodges, and are entitled to preside therein, and vote on all subjects, save and except the distribution of funds, the election of officers, and the formation of by-laws.

GRAND LODGE, OFFENCES BY MEMBERS OF.

52. Any offence committed by one member of the Grand Lodge against another in the Grand Lodge, or in the Grand Committee, shall be tried and determined by the Grand Lodge.

PRIVATE LODGE.

MEETINGS, NOTICE OF.

53. Every Lodge shall meet once a month, and the Master of each Lodge shall give, or cause to be given, notice of every quarterly meeting to each member; and any Master neglecting to regularly convene his Lodge shall be liable to suspension.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

54. Each Private Lodge shall, at its October meeting, elect a Master, Deputy Master, Secretary, Treasurer, and Chaplain, Inner Guard, Outside Tyler, and five Committee men. Members so selected shall be of the Purple Degree, and shall be installed if confirmed by the Grand Degree at the meeting directly following the Grand Lodge meeting. No member shall be eligible for office until qualified to give the Orange degree.

MASTER, DUTIES OF.

55. The Master, or, in his absence, the Deputy Master, Past Master, or any officer of the Lodge, shall preside, and be responsible for the proper discipline and correct management of the business of the Lodge. The Master shall also be answerable to the Grand Lodge for the correct keeping of the books, and the safe custody of the funds, during his term of office.

OFFICERS ABSENT FROM DUTIES.

56. Any officer of a Private Lodge absent from three consecutive monthly meetings, shall be deemed to have vacated his office, unless the Lodge shall pass a resolution to the contrary, and any vacancy may be forthwith filled by the Lodge, subject to confirmation by the Grand Lodge.

COMMITTEE, DUTIES OF.

57. The duties of the Committee of a Private Lodge shall be, to enquire and report as to the character of candidates, to examine and determine all matters referred to them, and to report their decision to the Lodge for confirmation.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER, DUTIES OF.

58. The Secretary shall keep the minutes, collect all dues, conduct the correspondence of the Lodge, and shall enter the names of members, with the office which any may hold, and

the date of election or appointment, in a book to be kept for the purpose, and make a return yearly to the Grand Secretary, within the prescribed time, of the names and residences of the several members, and all persons who have resigned, been rejected, suspended or expelled, with the reasons for such rejection, suspension, or expulsion, together with the time and place of meeting of the Lodge, signed by the Master, and bearing the seal. The Treasurer shall receive all money from the Secretary, and pay the same into such bank as the Lodge may decide on. All payments shall be made through such officers, and in such manner, as the Lodge may direct.

PROPOSITION OF CANDIDATES.

59. No candidate shall be admitted except according to Rule 1, nor until the proposer and seconder have certified that he is a Protestant of known loyalty, above eighteen years of age, and not married to a Roman Catholic; and before the admission of a Candidate, the proposer shall satisfy the Lodge that he has placed a copy of the Laws of the Orange Institution in his hands, or otherwise made him acquainted with the qualifications necessary for him to become a member of the Orange Institution, and that he approves of the same.

CLEARANCES.

60. Any financial member desiring to join another Lodge, shall be entitled to a certificate of membership ,to be forwarded to the Lodge he wishes to join, if in the Australian colonies, signed by the Master and Secretary, under the seal of the Lodge, for which he shall pay 2s. 6d.; but if the member has deposited a certificate in the Lodge when joining it, he shall receive the same *gratis*, endorsed by the Master and Secretary, under the seal of the said Lodge; and no certificate shall be refused except for improper conduct. Every resigning member shall receive a certificate, signed by the Master and Secretary, that he is financial to date of resignation.

CLEARANCES, LODGES REFUSING.

61. Should any Lodge refuse a certificate or clearance without sufficent cause, the Grand Lodge may, on appeal, grant it; and should any Lodge grant a certificate to a person not entitled to it, such Lodge shall be liable to suspension. The clearance of any member who is refused admission into another Lodge, shall be forthwith returned to the Lodge issuing the same.

LODGES, POWER TO TRY CHARGES.

62. Every Lodge shall have power to try any charge

against any of its members, and to adjudicate thereon, and of suspending or expelling such members proved to have violated any of the rules or principles of the Institution; such suspension or expulsion to take effect from the time when pronounced, so as to exclude such members from every Private Lodge, but not from the Institution until confirmed by the Grand Lodge.

LODGE SEALS.

63. All Private Lodges shall procure their Lodge Seals through the Grand Lodge, and all communications from any Lodge shall have the seal affixed.

SEAL NOT TO BE AFFIXED TO DOCUMENTS, ETC.

64. No Secretary of a Lodge shall affix the Seal to any letter or document calculated to injure a brother, unless the same has been approved of at a Lodge meeting.

MEMBER OUT OF DISTRICT.

65. Any member residing more than five miles from a Lodge-room, shall be entitled, on application, to have half of his dues remitted.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, LODGES NOT TO SOLICIT WITHOUT CONSENT.

66. No Private Lodge shall solicit subscriptions from any other Private Lodge, or member thereof, without the sanction of the Grand Lodge.

DEGREES CONFERRED UNDER WARRANT.

67. The two degrees of the Institution, the Orange and the Purple, shall be conferred in each Lodge under the authority of its Warrant; but the Purple shall not be given by any member who is not authorised by Certificate of the Grand Lodge; and such Certificate shall be issued to qualified persons, and shall remain in force for the current year only.

BY-LAWS.

68. All Lodges shall have the power of making and altering such by-laws for their own government as are not inconsistent with the laws of the Institution, such by-laws and alterations to be confirmed by the Grand Lodge, and a copy deposited with the Grand Secretary.

[Next follow the usual rules of order and debate, the method of taking the vote, and the order of business at Grand, District, and Private Lodge meetings.]

Index of Authorities

REFERRED TO IN THE COURSE OF THIS VOLUME.

N.B.—The bracketed figures which follow the title of the book, etc., indicate the number of distinct passages of the authority in question which have been quoted, or to which the reader has been referred.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

Acts of Parliament (82).

Parliamentary Debates, Journals, etc., (60).[1]

Reports of the two Parliamentary Select Committees of Inquiry into the Orange society in 1835 (287).[2]

Report of Select Committee of

[1]These passages include quotations from, or references to, speeches, etc., by the following Protestant members:

Earl Derby and Lord John Russell, Prime Ministers; Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Stanley, and Mr. Trevelyan, Chief Secretaries for Ireland; Baron Dowse, Attorney-General for Ireland; Mr. Hume; and the following Orange or philo-Orange members: Viscount Crichton, Lord Claude Hamilton, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. Saunderson, Mr. Verner. The only Catholic members whose speeches or questions have been drawn on are Mr. Callan, Mr. Finn, and Mr. McCarthy Downing. References have been given from other sources to the Parliamentary utterances of the following Protestant members: Mr. Grattan, Mr. Canning, Mr. Vandeleur, Dr. Brown, the Knight of Kerry, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. W. Wynne, Lord William Russell, Lord Clare, Lord Arthur Wellesley, Sir Laurence Parsons, Sir John Newport, Sir Henry Parnell, and three Orange members of the Irish Parliament, namely, Mr. J. C. Beresford, Dr. Duigenan, and Mr. T. Verner.

[2]The passages referred to include some 37 expressions of opinion by the Parliamentary Committee (English) in condemnation of the Orange society. The *Minutes of Evidence* contain the testimony of the following Protestant witnesses:

Mr. Richardson Bell, J.P. (4), the Earl of Caledon (5), Captain W. S. Crawford, M.P. (2), Mr. James Christie (27), Rev. Mr. Donaldson, Captain Duff (5), Lord Gosford (3), Mr. J. Gore, J.P., Mr. Handcock, J.P. (7), Mr. McConnell, Captain Patton, Mr. Randall, J.P., Mr. Sinclair, J.P. (10), Constable Stratton (5), Inspector-General Steven (16), and others. Evidence is also included in the above-mentioned figures from the following leaders of the Orange society: Assistant Grand Secretary Stewart Blacker, D.G.M., Col. Blacker (24), D.G.S. Fairman (23), Rev. Holt Waring (2), Grand Chaplain Mortimer O'Sullivan (7), D.G.M. Randall Plunkett (2), Deputy Grand Secretary Swan (3), Colonel Verner (6). The only Catholic witnesses whose evidence is referred to are Mr. Kernan (7) and (I think) Dr. Mullen (2). For the constitution of the Irish Parliamentary Committee see pp. 45-46,

House of Lords, 1839, to inquire into the State of Ireland with respect to Crime (5).

Report of Select Committee of House of Lords, 1852, on Outrages in Ireland (22).

Report of Parliamentary Select Committee on the *Belfast Corporation, Lunatic Asylums, etc., Bill* of 1892 (7).

Report of Parliamentary Select Committee on the *Belfast Corporation Bill* of 1896 (18).

Report of Parliamentary Select Committee on the *Londonderry Improvement Bill* of 1896 (4).

Reports, etc., of Commissioner Berwick and others on the disturbances at Dolly's Brae in 1849 (9).

Reports of Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the disturbances at Belfast in 1857 (69).[3]

Ditto, 1864 (1).

Ditto, 1886 (24).

Reports of Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the disturbances at Derry in 1869 (29).

Ditto, 1883 (2).[4]

Report of Board of Inquiry into the Post Office and Telegraph Department, Melbourne, 1896 (see Preface).

HISTORIANS AND OTHER WRITERS.

Non-Catholic:

BARRINGTON, SIR JONAH: *Personal Sketches* and *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation* (15).

BOUVERIE-PUSEY, *The Past History of Ireland* (10).

BROUGHAM, LORD, *Life and Times* (6).

BUCKINGHAM, DUKE OF, *Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of William IV. and Victoria* (1).

BURKE, EDMUND, *Correspondence*, and *Tract on the Popery Laws*, etc. (3).

CHAMBERS' *Encyclopædia* (5).

Constitutional Year Book (1).

CORNWALLIS, *Memoirs and Correspondence* (20).

CURRAN'S *Speeches* (1).

DICKENS, *American Notes* (1).

DICKSON (BISHOP), *Narrative* (1).

note, supra. From the works of Lecky and others references have been given to the proceedings of the Parliamentary Select Committees of 1793 and 1798, and to various official reports made to the Government by the Earl of Gosford, Lord Caledon, Captains Patton and Duff, Mr. Sergeant Perrin, Mr. Handcock, J.P., and others.

[3]Some 29 of the passages referred to above are expressions of opinion by the Royal Commissioners, strongly condemning the Orange association. The statements drawn from the *Minutes of Evidence* and the Appendices to their *Report* are (with at most one exception) from exclusively Orange and Protestant sources. Several of the chief witnesses whose testimony is drawn upon, or referred to, in this *Report* were Orangemen, such as, for instance, Grand Master the Earl of Enniskillen, Mr. Gwynne, representative of the Irish Grand Lodge, Constable Robert Blair, and Revs. H. Hanna and Dr. Drew. The references to the other Royal Commissions contain (with one or two exceptions) either the statements of the Royal Commissioners themselves, the statistics collected by them, or the evidence of Protestant witnesses.

[4]See pp. 394-395, *supra*, *note* 21.

EMMET, O'CONNOR, and MCNEVIN, *Memoir of the Union* (3).[5]

Encyclopædia Britannica (5).

FLETCHER, JUDGE, *Charge* to the Wexford Jury (9).[6]

FOX, J. A., *A Key to the Irish Question* (1).

FROUDE, J. A., *The English in Ireland* (11).

GALLOWAY RIGG, *Papers on Ulster*.

GODKIN, *The Battlefields of Ninety-eight* and *The Land War in Ireland* (15).

GOLDWIN-SMITH, *Irish History and Irish Character* (2).

GORDON, REV. JAMES, *History of the Rebellion* (21).

GRATTAN'S *Life and Letters* (3).

GREVILLE'S *Journals of the Reigns of King George IV. and of King William IV.* (7).

HARRIS, SEYMOUR F., *Principles of the Criminal Law* (6).

HILL'S *Plantation of Ulster* (1).

HOLLAND, LORD, *Memoirs of the Whig Party* (5).

HOLT'S *Memoirs* (1).

HOWARD'S *Popery Cases* (1).

IRWIN'S *History of Presbyterianism outside Ulster* (1).

Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (1).

JOHNSTON, W. (Deputy Grand Master), *Nightshade* (1).

KILLEN, REV. W. D., *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (46).

KNOX WIGRAM, W., *The Justice's Note-book* (2).

LARCOM'S *Ordnance Survey of Derry* (2).

LECKY, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, *History of Ireland in the 18th Century*, and *History of England in the 18th Century* (406).

LEFFINGWELL, ALBERT, M.D., *Illegitimacy* (1).

MACAULAY, *History of England* (2).

MARTINEAU, HARRIET, *The Thirty Years' Peace* (24).

MCKNIGHT, THOMAS, *Ulster as It Is; or Twenty-eight Years' Experience as an Irish Editor* (2).

MCLENNAN, J. F., *Memoir of Thomas Drummond* (1).

Memoirs of Wolfe Tone (2).

MILNER, REV. J., and OSWALD W. BRIERLY, *The Cruise of the H.M.S. Galatea* (2).

MITCHEL, *History of Ireland* and *Reply to the Falsification of History by James Anthony Froude* (56).

MOLESWORTH, REV. W. NASSAU, *History of England* (16).

MOLYNEUX, *Case of Ireland* (1).

MORRISON DAVIDSON, *The Book of Erin* (7).

[5] The *Memoir* is here set down as the work of non-Catholics, two of its writers, Emmet and O'Connor, being members of the Established Church. See p. 24, *note* 43. *Per contra*, a number of quotations are hereunder attributed to a Catholic source (McNevin's collection of *Pieces of Irish History*), although many of them were written by Protestants. Cf. p. 24, *supra*, *note* 45.

[6] References are given from the newspaper press and other sources, for the condemnation of Orange magistrates or jurors by Chief Justice Bushe, Sir F. Brady, Judges Barry, Lawson, Murphy, and Osborne.

MUSGRAVE, *Memoir of the Different Rebellions in Ireland*, and *Strictures* on Plowden's *Historical Review* (28).[7]
"OBSERVER," *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (5).
O'CONOR MORRIS, JUDGE, *Ireland: 1642-1868* (1).
PHILLIPS, CHARLES, *Speeches*, and *Curran and His Contemporaries* (5).
Pictorial History of England (2).
PRENDERGAST, *The Cromwellian Settlement* (3).
SAMPSON, W., *Memoirs* (3).
SHEFFIELD, LORD, *Observations on the Trade of Ireland* (1).
SMITH, REV. SYDNEY, *Peter Plymley's Letters, Ireland and England*, etc. (5).
SPENCER WALPOLE, *History of England* (4).
STEAD, W. T., *If Christ came to Chicago* (2).
STEPHEN'S *Inquiry* (1).
STOCK, DR. (Bishop of Killala), *A Narrative of What Passed at Killala* (1).
SWIFT, DEAN, *Works* (1).
SWIFT, MCNEIL, *English Interference with Irish Industries* (2).
TAYLOR, *The Irish Civil Wars* (1).
TAYLOR, REV. GEO., *History of the Rebellion in the County of Wexford* (6).[8]
"ULSTERMAN" (F. Morgan), *Rise and Progress of Orangeism* (2).
WALPOLE, *History of the Kingdom of Ireland* (54).
WEBB, ALFRED, *Compendium of Irish Biography* (5).
WESLEY'S *Journal* (2).
WEST, DEAN, *The Endowed Schools Commission* (1).
WHITE, W., *The Inner Life of the House of Commons* (2).
WITHEROW, REV. DR., *Derry and Enniskillen* (1).
WRIGHT, REV. G. N., *Life of William IV.* (1).
YOUNG, ARTHUR, *Tour in Ireland* (6).
YOUNG, ROBERT, Orange "poet" (2).

Catholic:

BARRY O'BRIEN, *Thomas Drummond* (12).
BOWLES DALY, *Ireland in Ninety-eight* (4).
BYRNE, MYLES, *Memoirs* (11).
CLANCY, J. T. (M.P.), *The Orange Bogey*, and *Ulster* (3).
DAWSON, C. (M.P.), *Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.*
DOHERTY, W. J., *Inis-owen and Tirconnell* (1).
FITZPATRICK, *Dr. Lanigan, his Life and Times* (1).
HAVERTY, M., *History of Ireland* (2).
HAY, EDWARD, *History of the Insurrection in Wexford* (25).
HEALY, T. M., *A Word for Ireland*, and *Loyalty plus Murder* (7).
KAVANAGH, *History of the Rebellion* (8).[9]

[7] Musgrave was an Orangeman. His *Memoirs* are the apology of the society. See pp. 57-58, *supra, note.*

[8] See p. 266, *supra, note* 38.

[9] Three of these passages are quotations: two from the *Irish Magazine* for 1811, the third from Bagenal Harvey's orders to the insurgent forces.

Life and Times of O'Connell (1).

MADDEN, DR., *The United Irishmen: their Lives and Times* (29).

MCCARTHY, JUSTIN, *History of Our Own Times*, and *Outlines of Irish History* (4).

MCGEE, T. D., *History of Ireland* (1).

MCNEVIN, DR., *Pieces of Irish History* (22).

"M.P.," *History of Orangeism* (63).[10]

MURPHY, REV. D., *Our Martyrs* (1).

O'CONNELL, *Memoir of Ireland* (1).

O'CONNOR, T. P., *The Parnell Movement* (5).

O'CONOR, *History of the Irish People* (3).

O'DOHERTY, REV. P., *The Truth About Ulster* (1).

O'NEILL DAUNT, W. J., *Eighty-five Years of Irish History* (2).

PLOWDEN, F., *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, and *Ireland from its Union* (104).

SCULLY, *Statement of the Penal Laws* (3).

SHEIL, RICHARD LALOR, *Speeches* (3).

WYSE, *History of the Catholic Association* (2).

NEWSPAPERS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

Non-Catholic:

Age, Melbourne (6).
Ararat Advertiser (6),
Argus, Melbourne (9).
Athenæum (2).
Ballarat Star (1).
Belfast Examiner (1).
Belfast News-Letter (2).
Belfast Weekly News (2).[11]
Chambers' Journal (1).
Constitutional Year Book (1).
Contemporary Review (8).
Daily Chronicle, London (1).
Daily Express, Dublin (20).[12]
Daily News (2).
Derry Standard (1).
Evening Mail, Dublin (1).
Financial Reform Almanac (1).
Globe, London (1).
Herald, Melbourne (1).
Irish Church Directory (1).
Irish Times (1).
Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser, Victoria (8).
Maryborough Standard, Victoria (1).
New York Herald (1).
North American Review (1).
Northern Whig (4).
Portland Observer, Victoria (3).
Riponshire Advocate, Victoria (3).
Times, London (12).
Victorian Standard, Orange lodge organ (154).
Walhalla Chronicle, Victoria (1).

[10] Forty-five of these passages are quotations from newspapers, rare pamphlets, etc., by Orangemen or Protestants, such as Wilson's *Letters* and *Narrative* (6), or those issued by the Catholic publicist, J. W. Battersby (2), the *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1836, the *Dublin University Magazine*, the *Belfast News-Letter* of a remote date, etc. The author was, I understand, a Belfast man.

[11] This is, I believe, an Orange paper, and I have seen it referred to as such. It is frequently quoted by the *Victorian Standard*; see, for instance, its issue of June 30, 1897.

[12] The *Daily Express* is the chief organ of the Irish Orange party.

Warragul Guardian, Victoria (1).

Catholic:

Advocate, Melbourne (2).
Belfast Irish News (1).
Derry Journal (8).
Freeman's Journal, New York (1).
Freeman's Journal and *Weekly Freeman*, Dublin (15).
Morning Star, Launceston, Tasmania.
Nation, Dublin (2).
Tablet, London (3).

ORANGE DOCUMENTS.

Circulars, tracts, leaflets (46).
Rules, ritual, etc. (132).[13]

[13] The number of references indicated above is independent of Appendices B and C

General Index.

ABERCORN, Duke of, 90; Lord, 316.
Abercromby, General Sir Ralph, 289, 292.
Abjuration of Popery, Oath of, 177-178, 186, 187.
Absconding of Orange criminals, 302, 304, 326, 327; of D.G.S. Fairman, 124.
Abuse of Catholic Church by Orangemen, 95-96, 149 *sqq.*, 396 (*note* 22); of the Pope, clergy, convents, etc., 95-96, 149 *sqq.*, 179 (*note* 47), 199 (*note* 29), 395-396 (*note* 22); of Catholic laity, 83, 125, 149-151, 161-169. See "Clergy," "Convents," "Pope," "Sermons."
Acre, Irish and English, 181 (*note* 59).
Act of Suppression of Orange society defied, 208, 356, 360-362.
Admission of candidates, 127, 156 (*note* 54), 401-407, 409, 420.
Aggressive character of Peep-o'-Day movement, 28 *sqq.*; of early Orangeism, 61 *sqq.* See "Orange society."
Agitators, Orange. See "Abuse," "Clergy."
Agrarian troubles and the Peep-o'-Day movement, 33.
"Aiding" the Civil Authorities, 205 *sqq.*, 247, 248-250, 341 *sqq.*, 402, 405.
Air, the Irish national, 43 (*note* 20).
Alexander, Mr., J.P., 77.
Allegiance, Oath of, in 1690, 174; of Orangemen, see "Loyalty."
Alliance meetings, Presbyterian, 18-19.
Altamount, Lord, 79.
America, emigration to, under Penal Code, 182; A.P.A. and No-Popery in, 11-12, 95-96 (*note*).
Ancient Britons, 264, 268-269, 273-274, 278, 279, 299.
Anglesey, "Papist," 98.
Anglicans and the United Irish Society, 26 (*note*); and the Orange society, 86-89, 90.
Annahagh, destruction of, 222, 307 (*note* 216).
Anne, Queen, and the Penal Code, 176 *sqq.*; and the Irish flax and hempen industries, 182; and the Salic law, 372.
Anniversaries, Orange. See "Abuse," "Demonstrations," "Processions," "Sermons," "Speeches."
Annuities on land under Penal Code, 181.
Anti-Catholic lecturers, 95-96, 156, 160, 179 (*note* 47).
Antrim militia, 268, 269, 291, 299 (*note*).
A.P.A. (American Protective

Association), 11-12, 95-96 (*note*).
Apostacy, inducements to, under Penal Code, 179, 180, 183-184.
Appeals in Orange lodges, 131, 412.
Appointment of officers, 128 *sqq*.
Apprentice Boys of Derry, 197, 202-203, 210, 225-226, 228.
Apprentices, Catholic, under Penal Code, 182.
Apron and Blue Degree, 400.
Armagh county, Peep-o'-Day and Defender disturbances in, 27 *sqq*., 36-56; the Catholic body in, 16, 22-23, 60; the Protestant body in, 16, 22-23, 60; early Orange outrages in, 70 *sqq*.; the magistracy and the outrages, 73, 75, 77, 260 (*note* 10), 312 *sqq*., 333; Catholics in town of Armagh, 395; Armagh militia, 299 (*note* 188).
Arms, use of forbidden to Catholics by Penal Code, 187; raiding for by Peep-o'-Day Boys, 28 *sqq*.; by Orangemen, 58, 59, 357; arms of Peep-o'-Day Boys and Defenders, 50; use of in Orange processions 43 (*note* 20), 201 *sqq*., 209, 210 (*note* 73), 218, 221 *sqq*., 226 *sqq*.; at elections, 132.
Arms Acts, 218.
Army, Orange lodges in the, 217, 342, 347-356, 366, 367-368, 385.
Articles of Limerick, 174-175.
Articles, secret, 59, 121-122, 356-358.
Ascendency, Protestant, 87, 173 *sqq*., 189-192, 247, 254, 266, 359; meaning of the words, 252-253; Ascendency party, their ferocity in 1798, 266, 291 *sqq*., 300-301.
Assault, the first, 357.
Assembling the lodges, 198-199, 357-358, 378, 385. See "Grand Master."
Atkinson, Captain, 39, 43, 52, 61 (*note*), cf. 315.
Attorneys and their clerks under Penal Code, 187.
Australia, Orangeism in, Preface, 5-8, 12-14, 85 *sqq*., 97, 126 *sqq*., 148 *sqq*., 154, 157, 165, 193, 210-211, 334-335, 351, 359-360, 368, 401 (*note* 8).
Authorities on the Orange society, 12-13, 15, 101-102, 332 (see Index of Authorities); on the Penal Code, 176.

BABYLON, the Church of Rome, 92, 151.
Bagot, Captain, 297.
Bailieborough, yeomanry outrage at, 221, 303.
Baker, Bro., 5, 154-155.
Ballaghkeene, yeomen at, 287.
Ball-alley massacre, Carnew, 291, 299.
Ballarat, Orangeism at, 7-8.
Ballot in Orange lodges, 127, 131, 245, 409, (see "Re-ballot"); Ballot Act and the Grand Lodge, 135 *sqq*.
Ballycanew (Co. Wexford) in 1798, Catholic loyal address from, 297 (*note* 183); battle of, 300 (*note* 191).
Ballyholan massacre, 269, 273-274.

Ballyvarley, Orange outrage at, 230.
Banbridge, outrage at, 221.
Bandon, exclusion of Catholics from, 182 (*note* 68); Earl of, 305; mutiny of yeomanry, *ibid.*
Bangor, Johnston's march to, 209; Banishment of clergy under Penal Code, 177, 178; of Catholics by early Orangemen, 74 *sqq.*, 316.
Bann, etc., yeomanry, mutiny of, 306.
Bantry Bay, French invasion of, 24-25, 265.
Barclay, Defender outrage on, 31 (*note* 81).
Barnes, Lieutenant, 306.
Barrington, Sir Jonah, 1, 80, 249 (*note* 23), 262-263, 266.
Barristers, Catholic, under Penal Code, 187.
Barrow, Bro. F., 7.
Barry, Lord Justice, on Orange juries, 330.
"Basis" of Orange society, 14, 144, 145, 246, 251, 310, 341, 408.
Battersby, W. J., 317.
Battle of Boyne, date of, 148 (*note* 16); of Diamond, 36-56, 70, 71, 72, 255.
Bedell, Bishop, 17.
Bedford, Lord, 281.
Beers, County Grand Master, 222 *sqq.*, 225 (*note*), 311 (*note*), 328.
Belfast: position of Catholics in, 253, 322-323, 386-390; Catholic magistrates and police in, 323; Orange police in, 323-324; sectarian riots in, 10-11, 220, 231, 335, 336; trial of Orange rioters in, 303-304; United Irish society in, 24; Protestant friendliness towards Catholics in, before rise of Orangeism, 20, 386.
Bell, Alexander, 302.
Bell, Richardson, J.P., 361, 362.
Belmore, Lord, 327.
Belturbet, Catholics excluded from, 182 (*note* 68).
Benburb Orange yeomanry, 302.
Bench-packing, 322, 328.
Beresford family, 64 (*note* 31), 275 (*note* 76), 300; John Claudius, 269, 286, 287-288, 292.
Bermuda, army lodges in, 353.
Berry, Canon, 109.
Berwick's official *Report*, 222 *sqq.*, 328.
Bible, Orangemen and the, 56; use of at initiation, 113-115, 401 *sqq.*; Bible and gun, 258.
Biggar, Joseph, M.P., 201 (*note* 35), 397.
Billy-goat riding in Orange lodge, 117.
Bishops, Catholic, and the United Irishmen, 26 (*note*), 265 (*note* 33); and the Defenders, 33.
Blackburn, Attorney-General, 326.
Blackburn, D.G.M., 245 (*note* 9).
Blacker family, 39 (*note* 7), 73, 311, 315, 337 (*note* 77), 348; Colonel, 38 *sqq.*, 39 (*note* 7), 208-209, 302, 307 (*note* 215), 311 (*note*); Dean, 39 (*note* 7); Stewart, *ibid.*
"Black list" of Orange lodges, 129, 410, 417, 420.

Black Lodge outrages, 222.
Black Mob, Hunter Gowan's, 266-267, 276, 290.
Black Preceptory lodges, 5, 400, 401 (*note* 8).
Black, Sir Samuel, 389 (*note* 8).
Black Watch lodge, 91 (*note* 29).
Blacksmiths, torture of, in 1798, 287.
Blair, Robert, 111, 323.
Blanket-tossing at Orange lodges, 118.
Blindfolding at Orange lodges, 118.
Bloodthirstiness, alleged, of Catholics, 158, 161, 164 *sqq*, 396 (*note* 22).
"Bloody Friday" massacre, 297.
Blue degrees, 400.
Books on the Orange society, 12-13, 15, 101-102, 332. See Index of Authorities.
Bottle riot, 98-99, 108.
Boulter, Primate, 186.
Bouverie-Pusey, S. E. B., 30, 295.
Box, Mr., 211 (*note* 73).
Boycotting by Orangemen, 73, 76, 83, 125, 131, 154, 162-164, 192, 335 (*note* 75), 403. See "Belfast," "Derry," "Elections."
Boyne battle, date of, 148 (*note* 16); colours worn at, 216 (*note*).
Brady, Lord Chancellor, order against Orange magistrates, 335-337.
Brady, Sir F., 330.
Branding of Priests under Penal Code, 177.
Bribery under Penal Code, 176, 179, 180, 183 *sqq*.
Britons. See "Ancient Britons."
Broe, Rev. F. J., 267 (*note* 42).
Brosnan, Canon, 396 (*note* 23).
Brougham, Lord, 368, 369-370, 372, 375 (*note* 65), 378.
Brown, Rev. Bro., 154.
Browne, Dr., M.P., 290. Rev. J. J. 245 (*note* 9).
Brunswick Clubs, 360-362, 370; demonstrations (Melbourne) 169, 199 (*note* 27), 218-219.
Buckingham, Duke of, 376.
Burial of Catholics in Penal days, 178.
Burials Bill (Ireland), 90.
Burke, Edmund, on Penal Code, 188.
Burridge, Rev. W., 152.
Bushe, Chief Justice, on Orange juries, 327.
Butt, Isaac, M.P., 393, 397.
By-laws of Orange lodges, 110, 122, 128, 418, 421.
Byrne, Myles, 270-271, 290 (*note* 148), 291 (*note* 152).

CALEDON, Earl of, 99, 195, 319; outrage at, 221.
Callan, Mr., M.P., 202.
Calling out the lodges, 198-199, 357-358, 378, 385. See "Grand Master."
Camden, Lord, 213, 263, 292, 315 (*note* 15).
Cameroy Orange yeomanry, 307.
Campbell, Rev. P., 191.
Canada, Orangeism in, 4-5, 9-11, 12, 112, 209-210, 386; army lodges in, 350, 353, 368.
Candidates, admission of, 127, 156 (*note* 54), 409, 420; initiation, 117-118, 401 *sqq*.;

list of rejected, resigned, expelled, see "Black list"; Orange, at elections, 131-139, 247, 403.
Canning on Orangeism, 205.
Canon Law, 166-167.
Carhampton, Lord, 34, 275 (*note* 76), 312.
Carlisle, Lord, 335, 337.
Carlow, military outrages in, 276, 277; cf. 268 (*note* 47); yeomanry in, 268; militia in, 277, 299 (*note* 188).
Carlton Club, address to, 373.
Carnew, massacre of, 291, 299.
Carr, Archbishop, and Orange processions, 219.
Carrowkeel outrage, 221.
Carter, Dean, 304.
Castlereagh, Lord, 65, 261.
Catholics, Irish: *Before and at rise of Orangeism:* their tolerant spirit, 16-19; a minority in Armagh county, 16, 22-23; friendly relations between them and Protestants, 19-21; their loyalty, 23-26, 297 (*note* 183); lower classes in Armagh, etc., Defenders, 23, 24, 27 *sqq.*, 32; better class oppose Defenders, 24, 32-3; Penal Code, 176 *sqq.* *After rise of Orangeism:* the first Orange Reign of Terror, 1795-1797, 26, 64-79; the second Reign of Terror, 1797-1799, see "Inquisition," "Insurrection," "Retaliation," "Torture," "Yeomanry"; Catholics join United Irishmen," 24, 26 (*note*) (see "United Irishmen"); excluded from the Orange society, 83 *sqq.*, 409; attempted exclusion from Civil service and public representation, preface, 7, 8, 125, 154, 162-163, 187 (*note* 84), 253, 335 (see "Ascendency," "Belfast," "Derry," "Elections," "Emancipation"); denied justice by Orange magistrates and jurors, 309 *sqq.* (see "Magistrates," "Jurors"). *Orange demonstrations:* Catholic grounds of objection to, see "Abuse," "Arms," "Demonstrations," "Emblems," "Massacre," "Penal Code," "Processions," "Raids"; Counter-associations, 237-238.
Caton, Rev. J., 94.
Cato-street Conspiracy, 362.
Ceremonies of initiation, 113-114, 401 *sqq.*; billy-goat riding, blanket-tossing, blindfolding, etc., 117-118; cf. p. 148.
Certificates, 420.
Challenges at the Diamond, 50; at Orange processions, 218.
Chaplains of lodges, 169. See "Clergy."
Character of Peep-o'-Day Boys, 32; of early Orangemen, 61-64.
Charity, Orange society and works of, etc., 103.
Charlemont, Lord, 262.
Charles I. and Irish Catholics, 173.
Charter Schools, 185-186.
Charter Toast, 79-82.
Chetwoode, Eustace, D.G.S., 349, 351, 365.
Children, Catholic, guardianship of under Penal Code, 184; bribery and prosely-

tism of, 183-184; brutal treatment of by Orange soldiery, 274, 277.
Christie, James, 75, 195, 202, 207-208, 314, 318.
Churches, Catholic, damaged, 9, 75-76, 224; cf. 200.
Civil Authorities, "aiding" the, 205 *sqq.*, 247, 248-250, 341 *sqq.*, 402, 405. See "Law," "Processions."
Civil Service, Orangeism in the, 382, 111, 238, 323-324, 334; proposed expulsion of Catholics from, by Orangemen, 7, 8, 125, 154, 162-163, 187 (*note* 84), 253, 335; of Orangemen by State, 333-334, 355, 383-384.
Clare, Lord, 262.
Clarendon, Lord, and the Orange party in 1848, 250 (*note* 26).
"Clemency" of martial law, Orange protest against the, 292.
Clements, Mr., 153.
Clergy, *Catholic*: Penal laws against, 177-180; attitude regarding Orange riots, 218-219, 220; vilification of, by Orangemen, see "Abuse;" hostile to Defenders, 33; and United Irishmen, 26 (*note*). *Orange clergy*, 88-89, 91, 151 *sqq.*, 155 *sqq.*, 164 *sqq.*, 167, 168-169, 199-201, 254, 307 (*note* 214), 334, 335; cf. 359. *Irish Protestant Clergy:* their tolerant spirit at rise of Orangeism, 20-21.
Clones, outrage at, 304 (*note* 205).
Clerks, Attorneys; under Penal Code, 187.
Cockburn, Sir James, 378.
Cockburne, Major-General 217.
Coile, Bernard, 59, 64.
Colour, the Irish National, 266 (*note* 39).
Colours, Orange party, etc., 210-211 (*note* 73), 213, 216 (*note* 15), 217, 266, 268, 317, 400. See "Emblems."
Commerce of Ireland, ruin of, by William III., 173, 182.
Commission of the Peace, Orangemen dismissed from, 40, 44 (*note* 24), 225 (*note*), 311 (*note*), 328. See "Magistrates."
Committee of lodge, 419; their "obligation," 84-85, 407.
"Common platform, A," 90-92.
Concealment of lodge documents, 122 *sqq.*, 145, 401, 412.
Conditional loyalty, 40, 121, 147, 306, 358-360, 402, 404.
Confession, attacks on, 155-156.
Confiscation under Cromwell, 80 (*note* 91); under Penal Code, 181; by early Orangemen, 72 *sqq.*, cf. See "Plunder."
Connaught, conduct of insurgents in, 296.
"Connaught, Hell or," 74 *sqq.*, 80, 316.
Conspiracy, the Cumberland, 362 *sqq.* See "Cumberland."
Constables, under Penal Code, 187.
Convents, Orange outrages against, 9, 228; vilification of, 159-161.
Conversion of Protestants under Penal Code, 179.

Conwell, Rev. Dr., 303 (*note* 201).
"Cooked" rule-books, etc., 121-122, 359.
Coote, Captain, 311 (*note*).
Corfu, army lodges in, 353.
Corinshiga massacre, 303.
Cork, position of Protestants in, 397, 398 (*note* 25).
Cornwallis, Lord, 67, 289, 292, 298-301.
Cost of Orange demonstrations, 4-5, 231-232, 250.
Counter-associations, 205, 237-238.
Counter-demonstrations, Orange, 200-201, 203-204, 226 *sqq.*, 234 (*note* 81).
Courts of law, Orange emblems in, 314, 317.
Courts-martial in 1798, 264 (*note*), 284, 289, 297-298.
Coveney, Rev. D., libel on, 159.
Cowperthwaite, Rev. J., 94.
Craddock, General, 23.
Crawford, W. Sharman, 207, 306, 319.
Crichton, Vicount, 249-250.
Cries at Orange processions, etc., 148, 201 (*note* 35), 211, 214, 215, 230.
Crimean war, Orangemen and the, 330-331 (*note* 64).
Criminals or offenders fêted by Orangemen, 221-222, 307, 311 (*note*); acquitted, aided, or shielded, 312, 314 *sqq.*, 208, 222, 302-304, 325 *sqq.*, 345-347. See "Jurors," "Magistrates."
Crimson Arrow degree, 400.
Crolly, Bishop, 218.
Cromwell in Ireland, 80, 258; Orange admiration of, 67, 80, 258 (*note* 3).
Crossgar, outrage at, 221.
"Croppy," the term, 214 (*note* 7); "Croppy Corney," 292.
Crown, forces of, defied, 205 *sqq.*, 307; cf. 330-331 (*note* 64); threat to kick the Queen's Crown, 100.
Cumberland, Ernest, Duke of, Grand Master, 348; orders processions, 205; his character, 363-364, 368, 369, 375 (*note*); his relations with Fairman, 364 *sqq.*; plot to secure the Crown, 122, 123 (*note*), 351, 362-382; promotes lodges in army, 348 *sqq.*; efforts for Regency, 365, 366, 369-370, 372; royal state in lodge, 366, 374-375; proposed prosecution of for high treason, 380; dissolves English lodges, 380-381.
Curfew Act, 263.
Curragh massacre, 296, 297.
Curran, John P., 77.
Cush, Bernard, 64-65.
Custom House (Dublin), torture at, in 1798, 288.

DAILY TELEGRAPH (Launceston, Tas.), libel by, 159, 347.
Date of Battle of Boyne, 148 (*note* 16).
Dawson, C. (Lord Mayor), 225, 394 (*note* 21), 396.
"Deadheads" of Ulster, The, 338 (*note* 80).
Declarations against Transubstantiation, 121, 178, 186; of Orangemen, see "Oaths," "Obligations."
Defenders, 19, 23, 24, 32, 36 *sqq.*, 272; before and at Diamond battle 47 *sqq.*, 54;

Defenders and United Irishmen 28; and Presbyterians, 61 (*note*); opposed by C. clergy, 33. See "Peep-o'-Day Boys."
Degrees, Orange and Purple, 107, 127 *sqq.*, 399, 421; other degrees, 399-401; ritual of Orange degree, 401 *sqq.*
Delegates to Grand Lodge, 128, 415.
Demonstrations, Orange: vilification of Catholic Church and body, see "Abuse;" newspaper reports of, 150; Catholics and, 171-173, 180, 184, 189 *sqq.*, 194 *sqq.*, 212 *sqq.*; processions, resistance to civil authorities, 205 *sqq.*, 307 (cf. 330-331, *note* 64). See "Arms," "Cries," "Crown," "Emblems," "Law," "Processions," "Tunes," "Outrages."
Demoralisation of Orange soldiery, 259 *sqq.*, 272, 273, 277 *sqq.*, 289 *sqq.*, 297 *sqq.*, 301 *sqq.*
Denworth, Jeremiah, 6.
Deputy Grand Masters, 126 (*note*), 415.
Deputy Master's "obligation," 84, 115, 406-407.
Deputy Secretary's oath, 84, 119.
Derby, Lord, and Orange "poetry," 150 (*note* 18); and the Orange society, 337 (*note* 78).
Derham, Colonel, 263-264 (*note*).
Derry, Catholics excluded from, in penal days, 182 (*note* 68); tolerant spirit of Protestants in, before rise of Orangeism, 20-21, 386; position of Catholics in, since rise of Orangeism, 21, 22, 197 (*note* 16), 253, 385-386, 390-394; protest of Derry Catholics, 394-395 (*note*); sectarian riots in 171, 173, 202, 225-226, 231-232; trial of Orange rioters in, 330.
Derrygonelly, outrage at, 303-304, 326.
Derrymacash massacre, 197 (*note* 16), 225.
Diamond, battle of, 36 *sqq.*, 70, 71, 72, 255; Col. Verner's toast of, 44 (*note* 24), 56.
Dickens, Charles, on Orangeism, 9.
Dickson, Bishop, 279.
Discoveries, Popish, 178.
Disembowelling, penalty of, under Penal Code, 177.
Disestablishment, Orangemen and, 132, 134 (*note* 33), 189, 254, 330 (*note* 64), 338, 382, 403 (*note* 18).
Disloyalty, charges of, against Catholics, 160, 161 *sqq.*
Disraeli Government and Orangeism, 338.
Dissenters, Orangemen and, 89 *sqq.*, 253, 359-360, 369 (*note* 48).
Distich, on bust of William III., 81 (*note* 95).
"Ditch-lining," 330 (note 64).
Documents of lodges, concealment of, 122 *sqq.*, 145, 401, 412; mutilation, etc., of, 46, 113, 122 *sqq.*, 162, 359; printing of, 113, 412; publication of, 120-121; inspection of, 412.
Doherty, J. W., 250 (*note* 26).

Doherty, T., murder of, 297-298.
Dolly's Brae massacre, 222 *sqq.*, 229, 257, 327-328, 335.
Dominion Parliament and the Orange society, 11.
Donaldson, Rev. Mr., 43 (*note* 20).
Donegal, a celebration in, 204.
Downing, McCarthy, M.P., 202, 321.
Downshire, Lord, 260.
Dowse, Baron, 197 (*note* 16), 206, 321.
Drew, Dr., Grand Chaplain, 166, 172, 200, 225.
Drogheda elections, 132; position of Protestants in, 398.
Dromore, outrage at, 327.
Drum-beating at Orange processions, 195, 214, 229.
Drummond, Under Secretary, on Orange processions, 193, 233.
Drunkenness, habitual, 97, 412.
Duane, Father, murder of, 221, 303.
Dublin, army lodges in, 353; torture of people by Orangemen in, 1798, 287-288; yeomanry in, 288; position of Protestants in, 397-398; rumoured rising of 1848 in, 250 (*note* 26).
Duff, Captain, 208, 248.
Dufferin, Lord, on Orangeism, 9-11.
Duigenan, Dr., 80, 249.
Dundas, General, 292.
Dunlavin massacre, 291.
Dunsany, Lord, 274-275.
Dunstan, Rev. Mr., 157.

EAR-SLITTING in 1798, 286.
Edinburgh, Duke of, 6.
Edinburgh Review on Orangeism, 222, 225 (*note*), 384-385.
Education of Catholics under Penal Code, 180, 184-186; Irish Education Bill, Orange opposition to, 132, 185 (*note* 77).
Elections, armed Orangemen at, 132, 249; Orange lodges, and, 131 *sqq.*, 247, 403; election rules, 113, 138-139; exclusion of Catholic candidates, 136, 403.
Emancipation, Catholic, favoured by Irish Protestants before rise of Orangeism, 19-21, 26 (*note*); Orange opposition to, 20 (*note* 16), 22, 99-100, 132, 133, 189-192, 201, 221, 305 *sqq.*, 312, 322, 330 (*note* 64), 338, 343, 361, 362, 369 (*note* 48), 387, 390, 394-395 (*note*).
Emblems, Orange, 148, 170, 193, 211, 213, 215-217, 229, 243, 399, 400, 413; worn by Orange soldiery, 266-267, 268, 270-271; in courts of justice, 314, 317; in church, 217.
Emigration, under Penal Code, 182.
Emmet, Robert, 24 (*note* 45).
England, No-Popery in, 12.
English in Ireland, by Froude, remarks on, 62-63 (*note*).
English Parliament and Irish Penal Code 175 (*note* 22).
English regiments in Ireland in 1798, 299-300 (*note* 191).
Enniscorthy, 266, 280 (*note* 104), 285, 303.
Enniskillen, exclusion of Catholics from, 182 (*note* 68);

Earl of, 4, 110, 213, 215, 240, 297-298, 311, 326, 337 (*note* 77).
"Escaped Nun," The, 96.
Established Church, Orangeism not founded to defend, 16, 19, 23, 32, 33, 35, 56, 69 *sqq.*; in Armagh county, 16, 22-23, 61 (*note*); revenue in 1868, 134 (*note*); early Orangemen belonged to, 86-89; certain members of, not admissible to Orange society, 92 *sqq.* See "Protestants."
Evans, P.G.M., 155.
Evidence of Orange witnesses. See "Witnesses."
Ex-Catholics and the Orange society, 95-96.
Exclusive dealing by Orangemen. See "Boycotting."
Exeter-Hall and Orange literature, 150.
Expelled, resigned, and suspended members, lists of. See "Black list."
Ex-priests, etc., 95-96.
Expulsion from the Orange society, 96, 97, 98, 128, 129, 133, 134, 136, 139, 145 (*note* 5), 246, 403, 404, 405, 409, 410, 412, 414, 417, 420, 421.
Extermination oath, 64 *sqq.*; extermination policy of Peep-o'-Day Boys, 33; of early Orangemen, 60, 66 *sqq.*, 300 (*note* 193), 313 (*note* 9).

FAIRMAN, Deputy Grand Secretary, 3, 348, 350; defies House of Commons, 122-124, 376-377; absconds, 124; deceives creditor, 376 (*note* 67); encourages illegal processions, 208; corrupts the army, 350; his part in the Cumberland conspiracy, 363, 364 *sqq.*
Falmouth, Lord, 368.
Federation of Australian lodges, 5, 112.
Felony, Orangemen guilty of, 74 (*note* 60), 305; cf. 109.
Ferguson, Rev. S. H., 152, 154, 155.
Fermanagh, juries and jury-packing in, 320, 322-323 (*note*); action of Catholic sheriff in, 398.
Ferns (Co. Wexford) in 1798, 266.
Finlayson, Crown Solicitor, 210-211 (*note* 73).
Finn, Mr., M.P., 199, 333, 379.
Firearms, use of, during Belfast riots, 231; firing parties at Orange processions, 202. See "Arms." Fitzgerald, Knight of Kerry, 75.
Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, 265.
Fitzmaurice, S.M., 223.
Fitzwilliam, Lord, 262.
Flanagan, Patrick, and the Limerick lodge, 85-86.
Flanagan, Rev. Mr., 100, 200.
Flax and hempen industries, 182.
Fleming, torture of, 269 (*note* 52).
Fletcher, Judge, on Orangeism, 171-172, 238; on Orange loyalty, 251-252; on Orange yeomen, 304-305; on Orange magistrates and juries, 317, 329.
Flogging in 1798, 269 (*note* 52), 277, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286-288, 292, 296 (*note*

79); defence of, by Musgrave and Orange party, 288-289.
Ford, J. P., 314.
Foreign education, penal laws against, 185.
Fortescue, Chichester, Chief Secretary, on Orange demonstrations, 194, 234.
Fox, Judge, 316, 325-326, 329.
Franchise, Catholics deprived of, by Penal Code, 186; Franchise Bill, Orange opposition to, 132, 186 (*note* 84), 189, 225. See "Reform."
Fraser, S., Grand Master, 137, 145 (*note* 7), 243, 245 (*note* 9).
Free-quarters in 1798, 272, 275 (*note* 76), 284. See "Martial law."
French invasion of 1796, 24-25, 265; of 1798, 296.
Froude, as historian, remarks on, 62-63 (*note*); his animosity against Catholics, *ibid.*, 177 (*note* 34); on the Orange yeomanry, 261.
Funerals of Catholics, Orange outrages at, 76, 229.

GABBET, W., 326.
Gallows, the Walking, 283 (*note*).
Galway, Catholics excluded from, by Penal Code, 182; position of Protestants in, 397, 398.
Game-keepers under Penal Code, 187.
General Orders against army lodges, 348, 351, 355.
Gentry and the Orange society, 64 (*note* 31), 259.
George II. and the Penal Code, 176.
George IV., and Cumberland, 364, 369, 375.
Giffard, Captain, 67, 273-274.
Giffen, 228.
Gladstone and Stuart Knox, 338 (*note* 80).
Glasgow, origin of Irish colony in, 79.
Godkin on Penal Code, 188.
Goldwin Smith on Orange outrages, 282.
Gordon, Duke of, D.G.M., 363, 378.
Gordon, Rev. James, as a historian, remarks on, 297 (*note* 182).
Gordon riots, 169.
Gore, J., 319.
Gorey in 1798, 266, 267, 297.
Gosford, Earl of, 72-73; Lord, on the Orange society, 201, 248, 307, etc.
Gough, Francis, torture of, 269 (*note* 52).
Government and the Orange yeomanry, 259 *sqq.*; connivance at Peep-o'-Day outrages, 28, 34; at early Orange outrages, 65, 77 (see "Magistrates"); at military outrages of 1797 and 1798, 262, 281, 288, 290, 291-292, 294.
Gowan, Hunter, and the Black Mob, 266-267, 276.
Gowan, Ogle R. (D.G.M.), 350-351 (*note* 18).
Grand Committee, 415-416.
Grand Orange Council, 5 (*note* 12), 131.
Grand Juries under Penal Code, 187.
Grand Lodge, constitution of, 128, 415; its secrecy, 128; its powers, 127 *sqq.*, 256, 341, 416, 418; its action at elec-

tions, 132 *sqq.*; support of No-Popery lecturers, 95-96, 160; encouragement of illegal processions, 207, 209 342-345; shielding offenders, 208, 345-347; attitude towards Orange magistrates and jurors, 310 *sqq.*, 342, 345-347; corrupting the army, 342, 347-356, 366, 367-368; defiance of Act of Suppression, 342, 360-362; its loyalty, 340 *sqq.*; its share in the Cumberland conspiracy, 363 *sqq.*; suppression of English Grand Lodge, 4, 335, 342, 380-381, 382: of Irish, 4, 362, cf. 382. See "Suppression."
Grand Master, his authority, 141, 374, 385; at election times, 138 *sqq.*, 247 (see "Elections"); of calling out the lodges, 151. See "Calling out."
Grand Tylers, 128.
Grant *v.* Mayor of Montreal, 11.
Grattan on early Orange outrages, 68, 73-75; on outrages of 1797, 263, 275, 293.
Green, Irish national colour, 216 (*note* 15); Orangemen's hatred of, 278; use of by Orangemen, 400 (*note* 6).
Greer, J. P., 311 (*note*), 314.
Greville, 364, 371-372.
Grey, Earl, 369, 378.
Grips, secret, 109.
Guard, inner, 119, 128, 419.
Guardianship of children under Penal Code, 184.
Gullibility of Orangemen, 168.
Gun and Bible, 258.
Gun-clubs, 201-202, 204, 238.
Gunpowder, torture by, 286.
Gwynne, Mr., 96-97, 144, 240.

HABEAS CORPUS ACTS, suspension of, 263.
Half-hanging under Penal Code, 177; in 1798, 277, 282-285, 296 (*note* 179).
Hall, King *v.*, 329.
Hamilton, Lieutenant, 327.
,, Lord Claude, 90, 250.
Hammer, Rev. C. H., and the billy-goat, 117.
Handcock, W. J., 42 (*note*), 43 (*note* 20), 248, 307.
Hanging of Priests under Penal Code, 177; of people in 1798, 271 (see "Half-hanging").
Hanna, Rev. H., sermons of, 200.
Hannigan, B., 391.
Harbouring priests under Penal Code, 178-179.
Hardwicke, Earl of, 347-348.
Harkness, Bro. E., on the extermination of Catholics, 68.
Hart, Rev. M. G., 94, 157.
Harvey, Bagenal, 298 (*note* 187).
Harvey, Bishop of Derry, 21.
Hawkins, Rev. F. C., 165.
Hay, Edward, 266.
Healy, T. M., M.P., 395.
Hearts of Oak, 62; of Steel, *ibid.*
Heathershaw, Grand Chaplain, 105, 107, 144, 152, 157.
"Hell or Connaught," 74 *sqq*, 80, 316.
Hemp and linen trade, Irish, under William III. and Anne, 182.
Hepenstall, the Walking Gallows, 283 (*note*).
Hertford, Lord, 359.
Hessian regiments, brutality of, in 1798, 265, 279.

Heywood and the Cumberland Plot, 379, 380.
Higgin, Bishop (Protestant), 197 (*note* 16).
High sheriffs, Orangemen, 320.
Hill, Bro. W. D., 7.
Histories of Orangeism, by Orangemen, 14, 94, 150 (*note* 18).
Holiday, an Orange, 229-230.
Holland, Lord, 67, 279, 284, 292.
Holmes, Mr., 194.
Holt, Joseph, 294 (*note* 172).
Holt, Waring, Rev., 71 (*note*), 106, 307 (*note* 214).
Home Rule, Orangemen and, 166, 203-204, 330, 331, 403-404 (*note*).
Hooting at Lord Caledon, 99; the police, 249. See "Police."
Horses, possession of by Catholics under Penal Code, 183.
Hotels, holding lodges in, 115-116, 119, 147, 412.
House-burning or wrecking by Peep-o'-Day Boys, 28, 33 (*note* 93); by Orangemen, 39, 42, 43 (*note* 20), 72, 75-76, 220 *sqq.*, 230-231, 251; by Orange soldiery, etc., 273-277, 290, 292, 296 (*note* 179); by magistrates, 266.
Houses abandoned by people in 1798, 276, 277, 287, 293.
Howard, Edw. (yeoman), 100 (*note* 65), 306.
Hurley, David, 6.
Hume, M.P., and Orange society, 308, 333; and Cumberland conspiracy, 379, 382.
Hunter Gowan, 266-267, 276.
IGNORANCE enforced by Penal Code, 184-186.
"Ignorant Irish," *ibid.*
Illegitimacy, Orangeism and, 406 (*note* 28).
Immorality, charges of by Orangemen against Catholics, 158, 159-161.
Impoverishment of Catholics by Penal Code, 180 *sqq.*
Indemnity Acts, 64, 263, 293.
Informers under Penal Code, 176, 178, 179, 181, 183, 185, 187; in 1798, 301.
Influence, baneful, of Orangeism, 102-103, 320-321.
Inheritance under Penal Code, 181, 183 *sqq.*
Initiation into Orange society, 113-114, 409; strange ceremonies of, 117-118.
Inner Guard, 119, 128, 419.
Innes's report on Orangeism in Scotland, 239.
Innocent or merely suspected persons, torture of, in 1798, 281, 282, 284, 285. See "Torture."
Inquiry, Parliamentary, into Orangeism, 45-46; inquiry suppressed in 1798, 293.
Inquisition, the Orange, 280 *sqq.* See "Insurrection," "Torture."
"Instructions" for the "higher degrees," 401.
Insurrection Act, 263, 313.
Insurrection of 1798 fomented by Government, 258 *sqq.*; by what means, 261 *sqq.*, 281-282, 284, 291, 292, 294, 295 (*note*); chief instruments, the Orange yeomanry, etc., 259 *sqq.* (see "Yeomanry"); martial law, 264, 271, 272, 295; house-

burning, etc., 266, 273-277, 290, 292, 296 (*note* 179); treatment of women by soldiery, 273-274, 277-280; by insurgents, 280. *The Orange Inquisition*, 280 *sqq.* (see "Torture"); murder and massacre by Orange soldiery, etc., 18 (*note* 7), 273-275, 276-277, 289 *sqq.*, 297 *sqq.*; ferocity of Orange party, 291-292; no legal redress, 293. *The Insurrection*; retaliation by insurgents, 295-296; excesses of Orange soldiery, 296-300; ferocity of Orange party after rebellion, 300-301; insurgents' hatred of Orangemen, 267.
Invasion, French, of 1796, 24-25, 265; of 1798, 296.
Ionian Islands, army lodges in, 349-350.
Irish, Catholics, tolerant spirit of, 17-19, 396-398; Protestants, tolerant spirit of before rise of Orangeism, 16, 19-21; commerce destroyed by William III., 173, 181-182; national air, 43 (*note* 20); national colour, 216 (*note*), 266-267 (*note*); Penal Code, 173 *sqq.*; Orange yeomanry, 257 *sqq.*
Italy, army lodges in, 350.

JACOB, Dr., 267.
Jaffé, Mr., 389 (*note* 8).
James II. and Irish Catholics, 173.
Jefferson, Thomas, 309.
Jesuits, abuse of, 396 (*note* 22).
Johnson, Judge, 316.
Johnston, Rev. Mr., 101; Rev. Dr., 236.
Johnston, W. (Deputy Grand Master), 198, 209, 210, 234.
Judges and the Orange society, 171-172, 238, 251-252, 304-305, 316, 317, 325-326, 329, 330-332.
Juries, Orange, 256, 304, 305, 310 (*sqq.*), 317, 319, 320, 321, 322, 326-327, 329, 330-332, 345-347, 385.
Jurors' oath, 309.
Jury-packing, 319, 322.

KANE, Rev. R., 245 (*note* 9).
Kennedy, Captain 250 (*note* 26).
Kent, Duchess of, 370.
Kernan (Barrister), 317 (*note* 21), 319-320, 327.
Kenyon, Lord (Deputy Grand Master), and the civil authorities, 347; and army lodges, 353; and the Cumberland plot, 363, 368, 369, 374, 377, 378, 379, 380.
Kerry, position of Protestants in, 396 (*note* 23).
Kildare, yeomanry in, 268; outrages by soldiery in, 296, 297; rebellion in 299 (*note* 188).
Killen, Rev. W. D., 16 (*note*).
Killyman, Orange Wreckers, 39, 42, 43 (*note* 20), 209; Orange yeomanry, 307.
King, Sir Abraham B., 108-109.
Kingsborough, Lord, 269, 270 (*note* 53), 288 (*note* 138).
King's County militia. 270 (*note* 53).
King *v.* Hall, 329.
Kissing cross on the Pope's foot, 157.
Kitson, Orange yeoman, 304, 326.

Knownothingism, 11-12, 169.
Knox, General, 66.
Knox, Colonel Stuart, M.P., 338 (*note* 80).
Knox, Vessey, M.P., 392.

LAITY, Catholic, abuse of, 161-169.
Lake, General, on the yeomanry, 273.
Land, annuities on, leases of, etc., under Penal Code, 181, *sqq*; confiscation of under Penal Code, 173, 181; League, Orangemen and, 99.
Langdale, Sheriff, 398.
Langley, Rev. H. A., 165.
Launceston *Daily Telegraph*, libel by, 159.
Law, Orangemen and the, 40-41, 43-44, 109, 110 *sqq*., 114, 115, 116, 194, 197 (*note* 16), 204 *sqq*., 217 *sqq*., 246-256, 281, 287, 306, 310 *sqq*. See "Crown," "Grand Lodge," "Loyalty," "Juries," "Magistrates," "Processions," "Torture."
LAWS, monopoly in making of, under Penal Code, 174.
Laws, etc., of Orange society, 408 *sqq*..
Lawson, Judge, on Orange juries, 331.
Leadbeater, Mrs., 277.
Learned professions, Catholics excluded from, under Penal Code, 174, 180, 186-187.
"Lectures" of the "higher degrees," 401.
Lecturers, No-Popery, 95-96, 156, 160, 179 (*note* 47).
Lecky, 69 (*note* 50); on Penal Code, 188-189.
Legislative Union, how effected, 258 *sqq*., 294; Orangemen and, 403-404 (*note*).
Leinster, Orange soldiery in, 265-268, 270-271, 275-291, 295-299, 301, 303, 304-305. See "Antrim militia," "Carlow," "Dublin," "Kildare," "North Cork," "Tyrone," "Wexford," "Wicklow."
Leland, Rev. T., 18.
Libel on Rev. D. Coveney, 159.
Liberal candidates, Orangemen and. See "Elections."
Liberal-minded Protestants, Orange hatred of, 98 *sqq*., 131, 133, 249, 316; cf. 398 (*note* 24).
Licensed victuallers, 115-116, 119, 147, 412.
Limerick, violated treaty of, 174-175, 178, 187; exclusion of Catholics from, under Penal Code, 182; position of Protestants in, 397, 398.
Linen and hempen trade, Irish, under William III., 182.
Link and Chain degree, 400.
List of resigned, suspended, and expelled members, etc., see "Black list."
"Literature" of lodges, 149, 156, 159-161, 217.
Liverpool, Orange processions in, 207.
Lodge era of Orangeism, 35, 36; first lodge, 54.
Lodges, Orange, institution of, 54, 56; forming new, 127, 410; chaplains of, 169 (see "Clergy"); in army, see "Army"; in public-houses, 115-116, 119, 147, 412; membership of, 83 *sqq*.,

128 *sqq.*; re-ballot of, 128, 129, 130, 245-246, 410-411; suspension or suppression of, 130, 420. See also "Calling out," "Grand Lodge," "Laws."
Londonderry Improvement Act, 390 *sqq.*
Londonderry, Lord, and Cumberland Plot, 363, 367.
Longford, Lord, and Cumberland Plot, 363.
Long Tower Church, Derry, 20-21.
Loughgall, 54.
Lowndes, 57 (*note*).
Lowther, Lord, 359.
Loyal subjects, William IV.'s appeal to, against the Orange society, 381.
Loyalty defined, 242; of Irish Catholics, 16, 23-26, 176; Orangemen's professions of, 241-256, 264, 267, 281, 241-256; rioting through, 226 *sqq.*; conditional loyalty, 40, 121, 147, 251-255, 306, 358-360, 402, 404; its selling price, 251-255 (see "Ascendency"); loyal "obligations," 247-256; loyalty of the Orange masses, see "Arms," "Crown," "Law," "Plunder," "Processions," "Raids"; of Orange juries and magistrates, see "Juries," "Magistrates"; of the Orange leaders, see "Cumberland plot," "Grand Lodge," "Queen"; of the Orange soldiery, see "Ancient Britons," "Howard," "Massacre," "Mutiny," "Plunder," "Tyrone," "Yeomanry."
Lurgan, Episcopalians in, 61 (*note* 21); yeomanry, 307.
Luttrell, see "Carhampton."
Lynch, Rev. Dr., 20.

MACARTNEY, Dean, 153, 165.
MacDonald, Major-General Sir J., 348.
Mackenzie, Lieut.-General, 306.
Madgwick, Rev. Bro., 93.
Madsen, Rev. A., 165 (*note* 82).
Magherafelt inquiry, 111-112.
Magheramayo massacre. See "Dolly's Brae."
Maghery, outrage at, 42-43, 221.
Magistrates, oath of, 309; and Penal Code, 178; Catholic, in Ireland, 322-323; and Peep-o'-Day outrages, 34; and early Orange outrages, 73, 75, 77, 260 (*note* 10), 312-314, 333; Orange magistrates, partiality of, 40-41, 43, 208, 224-225, 249, 256, 265, 313 *sqq.*, 345-347, 385; refusing to receive or act on informations, 41, 313-314, 325 *sqq.*; declared unfit for office, 333-334, 335-337; Lord Chancellor Brady's order against, 335-337; dismissed from office, 40, 44 (*note* 24), 225 (*note*), 311 (*note*), 328.
Malta, army lodges in, 349-350, 353.
Malyon, Rev. T. J., 157, 159, 167.
Mandeville, Viscount, 201.
"Mangling" by Orangemen in Dublin, 288 (*note* 132).
Manifesto of Dublin Orangemen, 68-69.

Manning, Cardinal, abuse of, 165.
Mansell, Rev. Mr., 48-49, 50, 199.
Maria Monk, 160, 266 (*note* 38).
Marriages, mixed, under Penal Code, 179-180; in later times, 191.
Marrying Papists, Orangemen, 96-98, 179 (*note* 48), 404, 409, 420.
Martial law in 1798, 264, 271, 272, 295. See "Free-quarters," "House-burning," "Insurrection," "Massacre," "Militia," "Torture," "Women," "Yeomanry."
Martin, John, 397.
Martineau, Miss, 363, 365, 370, 371, 376 (*note* 67), 380-381.
Mass, Orangeman expelled for attending at, 145 (*note* 5); Royal family, condemned for, 100-101.
Massacre, alleged, of 1641, 18; bogey of future massacre of Protestants, 164 *sqq.*, 396 (*note* 22); massacres by soldiers, yeomen, etc., 18 (*note* 7), 273-275, 276-277, 289 *sqq.*, 297 *sqq.*; by Orangemen, 220 *sqq.*, 225, 282, 327-328.
Master of lodge, "obligation" of, 84, 115, 406-407.
Mathew, Father, Orangemen and, 191.
Mathieson, Rev., 94, 152.
Maynooth Grant, 133-134.
Mayors, Protestant, in South and West, 397-398.
McBrian, murder of, 327.
McCabe, murder of, 327.
McCarthy Downing, Mr., M.P., 202, 321.
McCarthy, Justin, 99, 364.
McClelland, Mr., J.P., 220.
McClelland, Baron, 302.
McCrea, Rev. J., his speeches, 199-200.
McCuster outrage, 304 (*note* 207), 326.
McGlade, murder of, 304.
M'Ilwine, Rev., 200.
McKeown, murder of, 303.
McKie, Corporal, 5, 351.
McKnight, Dr. James, 167 and *note* 97, 171, 196, 202 (*note* 46), 214, 239.
McKnight, Thomas, 214, 231.
McLaughlin, W., Q.C., 394.
McMeekin, Father, outrage on, 31 (*note* 81).
McNally, informer, on Orange justice, 314-315.
McNevin, Dr., 24 (*note* 45), 37, 263.
Meath yeomanry, 268.
Melbourne, Orange riots, etc., in, 6, 218-219.
Membership of lodges, 83 *sqq.*, 128 *sqq.*, see "Ballot," "Black list," "Expulsion," "Initiation," "Lodges," "Suspension."
Members of Parliament, Protestant, for Catholic electorates, 396-397.
Memoir of the Union, 24 (*note* 45).
Memorial of Belfast Catholics, 322; of Derry Catholics, 394-395 (*note*).
Meeting-place of lodges, precautions regarding, 418. See "Public-houses," "Tylers."
Militia, Irish, in 1798, 265, 266, 268, 269-271, 279, 285,

286, 287, 291, 294 (*note* 172), 298.
Miller, Mr., J.P., 220.
Mitchel, John, 17 (*note* 5).
Mixed marriages, laws against, 179-180, 191.
Moira, Lord, 78, 275.
Moira yeomanry, mutiny of, 306.
Molesworth, Rev. W. Nassau, 147, 189-190; on the Cumberland plot, 382-383 (*note*).
Molesworth, Sir W., 380 (*note* 73).
Monaghan magistrates and juries, 322, 330.
Monasteries, etc., suppression of, under Penal Code, 178.
Monk, Maria, 160, 266 (*note* 38).
Monopolies created by Penal Code, 173 *sqq.*, 186; claimed by Orangemen, 252-253.
Montgomery, Sir H., 221.
Montreal riots, 210.
Moore, Mr. Serjeant, 303 (*note* 201).
Moore, Sir John, 268 (*note* 45), 300 (*note* 191).
Morality, Orangeism and, 97-98, 102-103, 406 (*note* 28).
Morgan, F. ("Ulsterman"), 14 (*note* 24), 94, 150 (*note* 18).
Mortgages on land under Penal Code, 181, 183.
Mottoes of secret societies, 143.
Mulien, Dr., 319.
Municipal and Parliamentary elections, Orange rules for, 136 *sqq.* See "Elections."
Murphy, Father John, 267 (*note* 42).
Murphy, Judge, on Omagh jury, 332.
Murphy, No-Popery lecturer, 156 (*note* 53).
Murvanogue, murder of, 326.
Musgrave as a historian, 31 (*note* 81), 57-58 (*note* 1); on the Orange society, 23 approves of torture, 288-289.
Musical festival, A, 225.
Mutilation by early Orangemen, 76; of lodge documents, 46, 113, 121 *sqq.*
Mutiny of Orange Yeomanry, 305-308.

NAPLES Convent, slander on a, 161 (*note* 73).
National air of Ireland, 43 (*note* 20); national colour, 216 (*note* 15), 266-267 (*note*).
Nationalists, meetings and processions of, 202, 204.
Navy, lodges in, 353.
Neild, Grand Master, 165.
Newry Orange yeomanry, 269.
New South Wales, Orangeism in, 5, 154, 165, 351.
No-Popery, Orangemen and, 5, 12, 82 (*note*), 149 *sqq.* See "Lecturers."
North Cork Militia in 1798, 265, 266, 268, 269-271, 276, 279, 285, 286, 287, 299.
Northern Star office wrecked, 293 (*note* 163).
Northern Whig, 225, 336.
Northumberland, Duke of, 207; Duchess of, 372.
Nose-slitting in 1798, 286.
Nucella, 349-350, 352, 353
Nugent, Lord, 350.

OATHS for Catholics under Penal Code, 174, 177-178, 186, 187; the corporal, 114; of jurors, 309; of magis

trates, *ibid.*; of Orangemen, 4, 39-40, 84-85, 97, 107, 108-109 *sqq.*, 119, 121, 247, 356, 400, 401, 404-405; of extermination, 64 *sqq.*, 300 (*note* 193); alleged, of Catholic priests, 165.
Oaths and Tests Acts, 4, 109, 112, 114, 369 (*note* 48).
"Obligations" of lodge officers, 406-407; of Orangemen, 247-256, 404-405; of Purplemen, 108. See "Oaths."
"Observer," 28, 293 (*note* 163).
O'Connell, 397 (*note*).
O'Connor, Arthur, 24 (*note* 45), 26 (*note*), 300 (*note* 193).
O'Doherty, James E., 394 (*note* 21).
Officers of private lodges, 127 *sqq.*, 419; of Grand Lodge, 416 *sqq.*.
O'Gorman, Auffray, Mrs., 96, 160.
O'Hagan, Lord, 191.
O'Hanlon, T., 390.
O'Kelly *v.* Rodolphus Harvey, 206.
Old Custom House, torture at, 288.
"Old True Blue," 14 (*note* 24), 150 (*note* 18).
O'Leary, Father, 18 (*note* 6), 19.
O'Mullan *v.* McKorkill, 82 (*note*).
Omagh trials, 331-332.
O'Neill, Charles, 391.
O'Neill, Constantine, outrage on, 41 (*note* 18), 302-303, 315.
Ontario, Orangeism in, 5.
Orange colours, see "Colours."
Orange degree, 127, 128-129; ritual of, 401-407.
Orange emblems, see "Emblems."
Orangeism and Protestantism, 93, 102-103, 255, 338, 384, 406 (*note* 28).
Orange politicians, 132 *sqq.*, 338 (*note* 80).
Orange society, the: its name, 57 (*note*); its connection with Peep-o'-Day Boys, 35, 36, 54 (*note* 52), 57 *sqq.*, not defensive, 16, 19, 23, 25-26, 35, 56, 69 *sqq.*, 82, 92, 104, 125, 147, 149 *sqq.*, 170-173, 189-192, 195 *sqq.*, 205 *sqq.*, 212 *sqq.*, 235, 249 *sqq.*, 310 *sqq* (see "Abuse," "Arms," "Confiscation," "Crown," "Extermination," "Insurrection," "Massacre," "Plunder," "Torture," "Yeomanry"); extermination oath of, 64 *sqq.*, 300 (*note* 193); character of the early, 2, 61-64, 69 (*note* 50); inaugural outrages, 31 (*note* 81) 64 *sqq.*, 69 *sqq.*; Orange society and United Irishmen, 24, 26 (*note*), 71 (*note*); religion of, 102-103; secrecy of, see "Secrecy"; organisation of, 126 *sqq.*; policy of party ascendency, see "Ascendency"; attitude towards Presbyterians and other Dissenters, see "Dissenters," "Presbyterians," "Primitive Methodists," "Salvation Army"; hostility to Catholics, see "Abuse," "Boycotting," "Belfast," "Civil Service," "Demonstrations," "Derry," "Extermination," "Insurrection,"

"Juries," "Magistrates," "Penal Code," "Processions," "Torture," "Yeomanry"; hostility to Government, see "Crown," "Demonstrations," "Loyalty," "Parliament," "Processions"; hostility to the law, see "Law"; hostility to Queen Victoria, see "Cumberland Plot," "Queen"; rules of the society, 4, 122, 126, 408 *sqq.*; its tendency, 102; its suppression, see "Suppression."
Oratorical display at Orange celebrations. See "Abuse," "Sermons."
Organisation of the Orange society, 126 *sqq.*
Oriel, Colonel, 305.
Osborne, Judge, on Orange magistrates, etc., 304 (*note* 205), 326.
O'Shanassy, Sir John, 6.
O'Sullivan, Rev. M., D.G.C., 29, 40.
Oulart Hill, battle of, 299 (*note* 190).
Outrages by Orangemen, 31 (*note* 81), 42, 43, 70-79, 98-99, 132, 217-232, 249. See "Inquisition," "Insurrection," "Massacre," "Torture," "Yeomanry."

PACKING of bench, 322-328; of jury-box, 319-322.
Paisley, Irish colony at, 79; rioting at, 232.
Palmerston, Lord, on the Orange society, 219, 337 (*note* 78).
"Papering," 74.
"Papist," the term, Queen Elizabeth's objection to, 158; use of in Penal Code, 158, 177 *sqq.*; by Orangemen, 96, 97, 98-99, 158, 190 (*note* 100), 300, 406; marrying a Papist, 96-98; "Papist" Protestants, 98-99, 108; "Papist" Orangemen, 99, 365.
Parker, Rev. D., 155, 165.
Parkes, Rev. W., 164 (*note* 82).
Parliament, English, and Irish Penal Code 175 (*note* 22); exclusion of Catholics and Dissenters from, 253; Parliament and the Orange society, 4, 11, 42 (*note* 19), 44 (*note* 24), 56, 117, 121-122, 123, 141, 194, 198, 200, 202, 203-204, 205, 208, 210, 221, 225, 233, 234, 249-250, 253, 304 (*note* 207), 318, 328, 330, 333, 338, 342, 343, 354, 370, 381.
Parliamentary Committees of Inquiry into the Orange society, 45-46, 97, 99 (*note* 62), 102, 108.
Parliamentary elections, Orangemen and. See "Elections."
Parliamentary Reform, Orangemen and, 132, 133, 189, 378, 379.
Parnell, C. S., 397.
Parnell, Sir Henry, 205.
Parsons, Sir Laurence, 75.
Party ascendency, see "Ascendency"; colours, see "Colours"; cries, see "Cries"; emblems, see "Emblems"; tunes, 43 (*note* 20), 148, 209, 211, 213, 229, 230.
Party Processions Acts, 7, 40, 99 (*note* 62), 194, 195, 205,

209, 225, 234, 249-250, 343.
Passwords, 5 (*note* 19), 107), 109, 111, 112, 115, 117, 120, 365, 407.
Patience of Catholics, 218-221.
Patrick Flanagan, case of, 85-86.
Patronage by lodges, 254, 384. See "Belfast," "Derry," "Elections."
Patten, Dr. 304.
Patterson, J. B., 158, 245 (*note* 9).
Peel Government and Orangeism, 338.
Peep-o'-Day Boys: their origin, character, and methods, 21, 27, 32, 61 (*note*); their movement aggressive, 28 *sqq.*, 35, 51, 55, 56, 70; extermination policy of, 33; partiality of civil authorities to, 34; connection of with Presbyterians, 61 (*note*); with early Orangemen, 30-31 (*note* 76), 35, 36, 54 (*note* 52), 57 *sqq.*; at Diamond battle, 48 *sqq.*, 54, 61 (*note*).
Pelham, Chief Secretary, 260 (*note* 13).
Penal Code, William III. and the, 173 *sqq.*; monopolies created by, 173-174; violated treaty of Limerick, 174-175; object of Penal Code, 176, 177, 180-181, 188; laws against Catholic clergy, 177-179; restrictions on ownership of property, confiscation, destruction of Irish trade, 180 *sqq.*; proselytising, 183 *sqq.*; laws against education of Catholics, 184-186; exclusion of Catholics from Parliament, etc., 186 *sqq.*; death of Penal Code, 20; Orangemen favour penalising Catholics, 178 (*note* 39), 179 (*note* 47), 181 (*note* 59), 185 (*note* 77), 186-187 (*note*), 189-192; penalising Dissenters, 90, 253, 369 (*note* 48); Froude and Penal Code, 177 (*note* 34).
Pennefather, Judge, 194, 209.
Perjury, 114, 353-354, 405 (*note* 25).
Perrin, Mr. Serjeant, 42 (*note* 19).
Perry, Anthony, torture of, 286 (*note* 121).
Persecution, Irish Catholics and, 16-19; by Orangemen, see "Abuse," "Boycotting," "Civil Service," "Confiscation," "Elections," "Extermination," "Inquisition," "Insurrection," "Juries," "Magistrates," "Massacre," "Plunder," "Torture," "Yeomanry."
"Peter the Packer," 320 (*note* 29).
Petitions against the Orange society, 121.
Phillips, Charles, 81-82.
Physical force, Orange policy of, 3, 125, 132, 198-199, 365, 366-367, 385. See "Calling out," "Crown," "Processions."
Picketing, torture of, 271, 277, 281, 282-285, 287.
Pillory, the, under Penal Code, 187.
Pirrie, Lord Mayor (Belfast), 389.
Pitched cap, torture of, 270, 271, 282, 285-286, 296 (*note* 179).

Pitt's Irish policy, 2, 26, 32 (*note* 82), 63-64, 258 *sqq.*, 292.
Pius IX, vilification of, 159.
Place-hunting by Orangemen, 254, 384. See "Elections."
Place of lodge meeting, 418. See "Public-houses."
"Platform, a common," 90-92.
Plot, Cumberland, 362 *sqq.* See "Cumberland."
Plowden, 37; on the Defenders 29 (*note* 69).
Plunder of Catholics by Orangemen, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 220, 231, 251, 268, 273, 274 (*note* 68), 277, 290, 357, cf. 277. See "Confiscation."
Plunket, Randel, D.G.M., 3, 132.
"Poets" and "poetry" of lodges, 14 (*note* 24), 98, 150 (*note* 18), 153, 225, 257-258.
Police, Orangemen resist, maim, or murder, 207, 208, 220, 228, 230, 249, 331; Irish police, Orange lodges in, 323; regulation against lodges in, 324; Orange police in Belfast, 111, 323-324; in Victoria, 324, 334; partiality of Orange police, 82 (*note*), 323-324.
Politicians, Orange, 132 *sqq.*, 140, 254. See "Elections," "Grand Lodge," "Grand Master."
Politics and religion in the Orange society, 2, 131 *sqq.*, 251-254, 401 (*notes* 9, 10), 403. See "Disestablishment," "Elections," "Education," "Emancipation," "Franchise," "Reform."
Pope, abuse of the, 80, 82 (*note*), 92, 148 (*note* 16), 157-158, 215, 230, 390 (*note* 10).
"Popish," use of the word in Penal Code, 177 *sqq.*, 190 (*note* 100).
Post Office Inquiry (Melbourne), Preface, 8, 40, 115, 162, 335.
Pound quarter, Belfast, 213 (*note* 2), 220.
Praemunire, penalty for, 179.
Presbyterians not persecuted in Ireland, 18-19; Presbyterians and United Irishmen, 24, 26 (*note*); and Peep-o'-Day Boys, 61 (*note*); and Orangemen, 87, 89 90; and Catholic refugees from Orange outrages, 79. See also *Regium Donum*, 134 (*note* 33).
Pressmen excluded from Orange society, 116.
Prevarication by Orange leaders, 44, 47, 69 (*note* 49), 351-354.
Price of Orange loyalty, 251-255.
Priests and Defenderism, 33; penal laws against, 177 *sqq.*; and Ribbonism, 239 (*note* 93); hunting of, 178-179; vilification of by Orangemen, 158-159, 199 (*note* 29); outrages, etc., on, 31 (*note* 81), 221, 300.
Primitive Methodist clergy and the Orange society, 91, 151, 152, 157.
Prince of Wales, Orangemen and the, 101.
Printing of Orange documents, 113, 120-121.
Prisoners, escorted by Orangemen, 222; murder of, 289, 290-291; rescue of, by Orangemen, 302.
Processions of Peep-o'-Day

Boys and Defenders, 29 (*note* 72); of Orangemen, 58, 170, 193 *sqq.*, 208-211, 212 *sqq.*, 318, 342-345; illegality of, 205-206, 208-211, 342-345; habit of carrying arms at, see "Arms;" Party Processions Acts, 7, 40, 99 (*note* 62), 194, 195, 205, 209, 225, 234, 249-250, 343; defiance of law, 40-41, 43-44, 205 *sqq.*, 248 *sqq.*, 342-345, 361-362; the Catholic party, 212 *sqq.*, offensiveness of processions, 170-173, 180, 184, 189-192, 193 *sqq.*, 212 *sqq.*, 232-235; result of processions: strife, outrage, 171-173, 205 *sqq.*, 212 *sqq.*, 217 *sqq.*, 385 (see "Outrages"); cost of processions, 4-5, 231-232; condemnation of, 232-235, 236-240.

Proclamation by insurgent leaders, 295 (*note* 176).

Professions, learned, monopoly of under Penal Code, 174, 180, 186-187.

Professions of secret societies, 105-106, 143; and official practice of the Orange society, contrast between, 84, 106, 143 *sqq.*, 156, 161, 164, 170, 189-190, 205, 214, 240, 241-257, 264, 271-272, 278, 301, 308, 310, 337 (*note* 78), 340 *sqq.*, 349, 354, 356, 384-385, 407.

Property of Catholics under Penal Code, 181 *sqq.*

Prosecution, proposed, of Cumberland conspirators, 380-382.

Proselytising under Penal Code, 176, 183-184, 185-186.

Protestant, meaning of word in Ireland, 23 (*note* 37), 86-88; "Protestant ascendency," meaning of words, see "Ascendency"; Protestant religion, Orange meaning of words, 86-89; Protestant succession, 370.

Protestant Alliance Friendly Society, 5.

Protestants, Irish, tolerant spirit of before rise of Orangeism, 16, 19-21, 386; conversion of under Penal Code, 179; Protestants alone eligible for the Orange society, 83 *sqq.*; the Established Church, 86-88; "the wrong sort," 92 *sqq*, 131, 133, 255, 316; "the right sort," 90-92, 129, 265, 402; Protestants, Australian, and the Orange society, 90-92; alleged intended massacre of Protestants, 161, 164-169, 396 (*note* 22); Protestants in South and West of Ireland, 396-398. See "Dissenters," "Presbyterians," "Primitive Methodists," "Salvation Army."

Protestantism and Orangeism, 93, 102-103, 255, 338, 384, 406 (*note* 28).

Prussians, sale of Irish Catholics to, 284.

Publicans and the Orange society, 115-116, 119, 147, 406, 412, cf. 191.

Publication of Orange documents. See "Documents."

Public employment, Catholics excluded from by Penal Code, 174, 186-187; readmitted to, 20. See "Civil Service."

Public houses, lodges in, 115-116, 119, 147, 412, cf. 191.
Public Service. See "Civil Service."
Purple degree, 107-108, 127 *sqq.*, 399-400, 410, 412, 418; oath, 65, 66, 108; qualifications for, 107-108.

QUAKER Missions in Ireland, 17.
Quakers in Wexford, 267 (*note* 42).
"Qualifications of an Orangeman," 14, 84, 120 (*note* 49), 144 *sqq.*, 246 (*note* 13), 251, 271-272, 278, 301, 354, 408 *sqq.*; of Purplemen, 107-108. See "Basis," "Law," "Loyalty," "Professions."
Quarter not given to insurgents (1798), 296.
Quartering, Penalty of, under Penal Code, 177.
Quebec, army lodges in, 353.
Queen's County, Orange justice in, 314-315.
Queensland, Orangeism in, 5.
Queen Victoria, Orange censure of, 99 *sqq.*, 100-101; Orange threats against, 100, 225, 254. See also "Cumberland."
Quinn, Rev. J., 395-396 (*note*).
Quorum at Orange lodge, 127, 418.

RAIDS by Orangemen on Catholic villages, etc., 42 (*note*), 43 (*note*), 132, 220-231, 327-328.
Rape. See "Women."
Ratepayers, cost of Orange processions to, 4-5, 231-232, 250.
Rathdrum yeomanry, 268.
Re-admission to the Orange society, 129, 130, 131, 410, 411.
Reballot in Orange lodges, 128, 129, 130, 245-246, 410-411.
Rebellion of 1641, 18 (*note* 7); of 1715 and 1745, 176; of 1798, see "Insurrection;" threats of, by Orangemen, 330 (*note* 64), 378.
Red Cross degree, 400.
Reform, Parliamentary, Orangemen and, 132, 133, 189, 378, 379.
Refugees from early Orange outrages, 77-79.
Regalia, Orange, 89, 212, 215, 216-217, 400, 413. See "Colours," "Emblems."
Regency, Cumberland and the, 365, 366, 369-370, 372. See "Cumberland."
Regium Donum, 134 (*note* 33).
Reign of Terror, the first Orange, 71 *sqq.*; the second, see "Inquisition," "Insurrection," "Torture."
Rejected candidates, 129, 405, 409, 410, 411, 417, 420. See "Black list."
Rejoining members, 129, 130, 131, 410, 411.
Relief Acts, 20, 33, 189-192. See "Emancipation."
Religion of Orangemen. See "Charity," "Orangeism," "Orange society," "Protestantism," "Protestants."
Religion and Politics in the Orange society, 2, 131 *sqq.*, 251-254, 401 (*notes* 9, 10), 403. See "Disestablishment," "Elections," "Education," "Emancipation," "Franchise," "Reform."

Reports of Orange celebrations, 150, 167.
Resignations, 129, 411, 417, 420. See "Black list,"
Retaliation by insurgents in 1798, 280, 295-296.
Revolution, Orangeism glorifies, 173, 251, 373; c.f. 255; Revolution of 1688, its results in Ireland, 173 *sqq.* See "Commerce," "Penal Code."
Revolvers at Orange demonstrations, 203-204. See "Arms."
Ribbon societies, 238-239.
Richardson, P.G.M., 245 (*note* 9).
Richmond administration, 303 (*note* 203).
Riding billy-goat in lodge, 117.
Riding-house, Dublin, torture in, by Orange leaders, 287-288. See "Beresford," "Flogging."
Riot Act defied, 207, 209, 228.
Rioting through loyalty, 226 *sqq.*, 249-250.
Riots at Orange demonstrations, 99, (*note* 62), 194 *sqq.*, 205 *sqq.*, 217 *sqq.* See "Demonstrations," "Processions." Gordon and Knownothing riots, 169.
Rise of Orangeism. See "Orange Society" "Peep-o'-Day Boys."
Ritual of Orange degree, 113, 119, 130, 401 *sqq.*; Tyler's, 407.
Ritualists, Orangemen's objection to, 94-95.
Robinson, Rev. Dr., 67-68.
Roden, Lord, 225 (*note*), 297, 311 (*note*), 328, 363.
"Roman Catholic," the title, 190 (*note* 100).
Rome, vilification of Church of. See "Abuse."
Rosslea counter-demonstration, 200-201.
Rossmore, Lord, 203-311 (*note*).
Royal Black Preceptory lodges, 400.
Royal Blue degree, *ibid.*
Royal Commissions on disturbances at Belfast, Derry, and elsewhere, 14 and *passim.* See Index of Authorities, 422.
Royal Exchange (Dublin), torture in, 288.
Royal State in Imperial Grand Lodge, 366, 374-375.
Rules of the Orange society, 4, 122, 126, 408 *sqq.*; for Elections, 137 *sqq.*; "cooked" books of rules, 121 *sqq.* See "Documents," "Lectures," "Ritual."
Russell, Lord John, 353, 356, 381.
Russell, Lord William, 289.
Ruthven, Mr., Crown Solicitor, 328.

SALIC Law, 372.
Salisbury, Bishop of, G.C., 88, 380.
Salisbury Government and Orangemen, 330-331, 338.
Salvation Army and the Orange society, 91.
Sampson, William, 66.
Sandy-row Orangemen (Belfast), 213, 220, 324.
Sandys, Major, and his Prévôt, 288.
"Satanides." See "Carhampton."
Saunderson, Colonel, 214, 234.

Scarlet degree, 400; Woman, 92, 151.
Scarvagh yeomanry, mutiny of, 306.
Scarves, Orange, in church, 217. See "Colours," "Emblems."
Schoolmasters, hunting of, under Penal Code, 185.
Scotchmen and Orange society (Melbourne), 91 (*note* 29).
Scotland, Irish colony in, 79; Orangeism in, 5, 89, 118, 239, 368.
Scott, ex-Sheriff, and O'Connell, 99.
Scourging in 1798. See "Flogging."
Scouring and search parties in 1798, outrages by, 289, 290, 298.
Scullabogue, massacre of, 280, 296.
Seals, use of in lodges, 130, 421.
Search and scouring parties in 1798, 289, 290, 298.
Secrecy of the Orange society Preface, 13, 106 *sqq.*, 128, 131, 358, 375-379, 399-401; oaths of, 356; declarations of, 113-114, 247-248, 405.
Secret Articles, 59, 121-122, 356-358.
Secretary's oath, 84, 119; "obligation," 115, 119, 407.
Secret of Orangeism, what it is, 124-125, 154 (see "Ascendency," "Civil Service"); how guarded, 107 *sqq.*, 399-401, 405; secret signs, 5 (*note* 12), 107, 109-112, 115, 365. See "Grips," "Passwords."
Secret societies, professions of, 105-106, 143; Orangemen and, 250-251; Catholics and, *ibid.*
Secret Parliamentary Committee, 263.
Select Committee on *Belfast Corporation Bill*, etc., 387 *sqq.*; on *Londonderry Improvement Bill*, 390 *sqq.*
Sermons and speeches, Orange, 148, 198, 200, 203, 204-205, 212, 217, 228. See "Abuse," "Clergy."
Servants, Catholic, 163.
Shamrock, Irish national emblem, 216 (*note*).
Shanks, Rev. T., 94.
Shaw, William, M.P., 397.
Sheffield, Lord, 19.
Shercock massacre, 221.
Shiel, Hon. Lalor, 67.
Sheriffs, under Penal Code, 187; Orange, 320.
Signs, 5 (*note* 12), 107, 109-112, 115, 365. See "Grips," "Passwords."
Sinclair, J., 200, 214, 248, 319.
Sligo, Protestants in, 398.
Sloan and first Orange lodge, 54.
Solicitors under Penal Code, 187.
Songs and song writers, Orange, 14 (*note* 24), 98, 150 (*note* 18), 153, 225, 257-258.
South Australia, Orangeism in, 5.
South and West of Ireland, position of Protestants in, 396-398.
Spaight, James, 397.
Speeches, Orange. See "Abuse," "Clergy," "Sermons."
Spies under Penal Code. See "Informers."

Stafford, County-Inspector, 202.
Stanley, Chief-Secretary, on Orange society, 194-195, 218, 343.
Stead, W. T., on Orangeism, 12.
Stewart. J., 153.
Stock, Bishop, 296.
Stoven, Sir F., 146, 195, 201, 208, 214, 248.
Stratton, W., 195, 201, 214.
Stuart, James, 306.
Stuart, Knox, M.P., 338 (*note* 80).
Style of Orange literature, 150.
Subscriptions for Orange offenders, 208.
Sullivan, James, Preface, 8, 335.
Suppression of the Orange society urged, 219, 337 (*note* 78), 339, 354-355; of English Orangeism, 4, 335, 342, 380-381, 382; of Irish, 4, 360-362, cf. 382; Act of Suppression defied, 208, 356, 360-362; suppression of lodges by Grand Lodge, 130.
Suspension of lodge, 420; of members, 128, 129, 130, 134, 136, 405, 409-410 411, 414, 417, 420, 421.
Symbols, secret. See "Signs."
Sydney Smith on Orangemen, 190.
Sydney (N.S.W.) army lodge in, 5, 351.

TAMMANY, the Irish, 312, 338-339.
Tanderagee, outrage at, 221-222, 304.
Taylor, Rev. G. (author), 266, 268 (*note* 45).
Taylor, Rev. D. T., 158.
Tasmania, Orangeism in, 5, 351.
Teachers, Catholic, under Penal Code, 185-186.
Temperance movement, Orangemen and the, 191.
Tendency of Orangeism, 102.
Tests Acts, 4; Orangemen oppose repeal of, 90, 369 (*note* 48).
Tests, Orange, 66 (*note* 37), 107, 109, 110, 356.
Theatrical display a. Orange demonstrations. See "Processions."
Thompson, D.G.M., 378.
Thornton, Bishop, on Orangeism, 335.
Threats, disloyal, of Orangemen, 100, 225, 254, 330 (*note* 64), 378.
Times on Orangeism, etc., 219, 225, 232.
Tithes Act repeal, Orangemen and, 132.
Titles of lodges, 413.
Toasts, Charter and other, 44 (*note* 24), 56, 79-82, 148, 274 (*note* 68).
Todd, Richard, 393.
Tolerance of Irish Catholics, 16-19; of Protestants before rise of Orangeism, 16, 19-21, 386.
Tom the Devil, 286.
Tone, T. Wolfe, 26 (*note*).
Toronto, Orangeism in, 9.
Torture, use of, in 1798, 262-263, 266, 268 (*note* 47), 270-271, 273, 280 *sqq.*; picketing and half-hanging, 271, 277; pitch-capping, 270, 271, 282, 285-286, 296 (*note* 179); scourging, 269 (*note* 52), 277, 286-289; carried out

and approved by Orange party, 287-289; its illegality, 281, 287; Government connivance at, 262, 281, 288, 291-292, 294. See "Beresford."
Transportation without trial, 34, 274, 275, 314.
Transubstantiation, declaration against, 121, 178, 186.
Treasurer's "obligation," 407.
Treaty, violated, of Limerick, 174-175, 178.
Trevelyan, Chief-Secretary, on Orange demonstrations, 203-204.
Trim elections, 132.
Troops forbidden Orange emblems, 217.
Truce of the Diamond, 51-55.
"True Blue, Old," 14 (*note* 24), 150 (*note* 18).
"True Protestant," 90-92, 129, 265, 402.
Tullyorier, outrage at, 221.
Tunes, party, 43 (*note* 20), 148, 209, 211, 213, 229, 230.
Tylers, 117, 119, 128, 400, 407.
Tyrone militia, 268, 299 (*note*); trials, 331; yeomanry, 279.

ULSTER, sectarian disturbances in, their cause (see "Abuse," "Arms," "Clergy," "Cries," "Emblems," "Processions," "Raids"); alleged superior wealth, etc., of, 245 (*note* 9); outrages by yeomanry, etc., in, see "Yeomanry;" administration of justice in, see "Juries," "Magistrates," "Witnesses"; illegitimacy in, 406 (*note* 28).
"Ulsterman's" history of Orangeism, 14 (*note* 24), 94, 150 (*note* 18).
Union, Legislative, how effected, 258 *sqq.*; Orangemen and, 203-204, 330-331, 403-404 (*note*).
Unitarians and the *Regium Donum*, 134 (*note* 33).
United Irishmen, chiefly Protestants, 20, 26 (*note*); object of, 20, 26 (*note*); brief account of, 26 (*note*), cf. 263; opposed by Catholic clergy, 26 (*note*), 265 (*note* 33); United Irishmen and Defenders, 28; and Orangemen, 272, 313; Catholics forced into, 24, 26 (*note* 294); in Wexford, 265; *Memoir* of, 24 (*note* 43), 25-26 (*note*).
United States, Orangeism in, 11-12, 118.

VALE, R. T., D.G.M., 7, 8, 12 (*note*), 97 (*note* 51), 137, 152, 153, 154, 243.
Vandeleur, M.P., 333.
Verdicts of Orange juries. See "Juries."
Verner family, 41, 73, 75, 311, 315, 348; Colonel, 38, 41 *sqq.*, 46, 47, 50, 53 (*note*), 54, 56, 59, 69 (*note* 49), 75, 107, 207, 302, 314; James, 41 (*note*), 43, 73; Thomas, *ibid.*, 66 (*note* 38), 76.
Vessey Knox, M.P., 392.
Veto of Grand Lodge, 128-130.
Viceroy, Wellesley, Orange outrage on, 98-99.
Victoria (colony), Orangeism in, Preface, 5, 126 *sqq.*, 148 *sqq.*, 210-211, 334-335.
Victoria, Princess, plot against. See "Cumberland."

Victorian Standard, 14 (*note* 23), 100 (*note* 63), 150 *sqq*.
Vilification of Catholics. See "Abuse," "Clergy," "Confession," "Convents," "Disloyalty," "Lecturers," "Massacre," "Pope," "Priests," "Sermons."
Villages, etc., abandoned in 1798, 276, 277; raids on by Orangemen, 220-231.
Vinegar Hill, 267, 280.
Visitors to Grand Lodge, 416.
Vokes, Mackey, 397-398 (*note*).
Volunteers, their tolerant spirit, 19; and Peep-o'-Day Boys, 34.
Votes of Orangemen, Grand Master's control of, 131 *sqq*. See "Elections," "Grand Master."

WALKING Gallows (Hepenstall), 283 (*note* 111).
Wallace, Brigade Major, 306 (*note* 211).
Walpole on Orange yeomanry, 277; on Penal Code, 188.
Warrant to reveal password, 120; for Orange lodge, 122, 128, 130, 410, 413-414, 418, 421; Irish exchanged for English, etc., 122, 351, 361; Cumberland's, 350, 352.
Waterford, position of Protestants in, 397, 398.
Wattle-blossom as Orange emblem, 215.
Wealth, Ulster's alleged superiority in, 245 (*note* 9).
Weapons. See "Arms," "Gun-clubs."
Weavers, Catholic, outrages on by Orangemen, 74, 75.
Wellesley, Marquis of, 98, 108, 378.
Wellington and the Cumberland plot, 368, 370-371, 375.
Wesley in Ireland, 17, 186 (*note* 81); favours penal laws, 18 (*note* 6).
West and South of Ireland, position of Protestants in, 396-398.
Western Australia, Orangeism in, 5 (*note* 12), 157, 211 (*note*), 401 (*note* 8).
Wexford before insurrection, peaceable, 276, 281; United Irishmen in 265; Orangeism in, 266-267, 270-271; yeomanry in, 260 (*note* 13), 265-267, 271, 276-277, 279, 287, 297, 300 (*note* 191), 303; North Cork militia in, 266, 269-271, 279, 285-286, 298 (*note* 188); Quakers in, 267 (*note* 42); cruelty of magistrates in, 266; how insurrection was caused in, 266, 295 (*note* 175); outrages on women in, 279; other outrages in, 293, 295 (*note* 175), 297, 299; use of party colours in, 266; town of, 266, 267; massacres in, 280, 290, 291 (see also "Scullabogue"); present position of Protestants in, 398.
Wheeler, D.G.M., 154.
Whipping under Penal Code and in 1798. See "Flogging."
White degree, 400.
White, Dr., 322.
White, Piers, Q.C., 394 (*note* 21).
Wicklow, Orangeism in, 267 (*note* 42), 268 (*note* 45); yeomanry in, 265, 268, 300 (*note* 191); Ancient Britons in, 268; militia in, 268, 299

(*note*); outrages on women in, 278; other outrages in, 276, 278, 281, 291, 293, 294 (*note* 172); massacre in, 291; cause of insurrection in, 295 (*note* 175).
Wife, the Papist (Orange song), 98.
William III. and Penal Code (see "Penal Code"), and destruction of Irish trade, 173, 182.
William IV., Cumberland plotters and, 370, 372, 379-380; on the Orange society, 355-356, 381-382.
Wilson, J.P., on Orange magistrates, etc., 41 (*note* 18), 302, 315-316, 333.
Witnesses, Orange, Preface, 39-40, 46-47, 108, 110 *sqq.*, 115, 123-124, 247-248, 321, 323-324, 385. See "Juries," "Magistrates," "Perjury," "Prevarication."
Wolfe Tone, 26 (*note*).
Wollaghan, Hugh (yeoman), 297-298.
Women, barbarous treatment of in 1798, 273-274, 277-280, 287; at Dolly's Brae, 224; respectful treatment of by insurgents, 280, 296; Orange lodges for, 116.
Woollen trade, Irish, destroyed by William III., 182.
Works of charity by Orangemen, 103.
Works on Orangeism. See "Authorities."
Wreckers, Peep-o'-Day Boys, 28, 33 (*note* 93); the Killyman, 39, 42, 43 (*note* 20), 209.
Wrecking of Catholic houses, churches, etc., by Orangemen, 72, 75-76, 220 *sqq.*, 230-231, 251 (see "House-burning"); by Orange yeomanry, 273 *sqq.*; by magistrates, 266; of *Northern Star* office, 293 (*note* 163).
Wynford, Lord, 363, 368, 369, 375.
Wynne, W., 238.

YELVERTON case, 191.
Yeomanry, Catholics and the, 25, 260, 265, 306; the Orange, 257 *sqq.*, 323; their rise, 258-261; their demoralisation, 259 *sqq.*, 272, 273, 277, 301 *sqq.*; their share in provoking the insurrection, 259, 261, 274 *sqq.*, 273-274, 281 *sqq.*; use of torture by, 281 *sqq.*; outrages on women, 278-280; murders, massacre by, 273-275, 291, 301 *sqq.*; conduct during insurrection, 296-300; in times of peace, 201, 207, 301 *sqq.*; mutiny of, 305-308.
York, Duke of, 348, 352, 359.
Young Ireland party in 1848, 250 (*note* 26).
Young, Robert (Orange "poet"), 14 (*note* 24), 150 (*note* 18).

Additional References.

Page 45, *note* 26: There were five Catholics on the Parl. Select Committee for Ireland.

Page 75, *note*: see also Lord Gosford's evidence, Q. 3600.

Page 99, *note* 58: see also Qq. 3736, 4201, 4210, 5438-5439.

Page 100, *note* 64: for further denunciations of Queen Victoria, by an Orange clergyman (Rev. Mr. McIlwine), see *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1850, p. 115, and *Times*, November 1, 1849.

Page 103, *note* 72: see also *Minutes of Evidence*, English *Report*, Q. 2862, and Appendix 5, p. 92.

Page 107, *note* 8: compare *Dublin University Magazine*, April, 1836, p. 405.

Page 132, line 22, and page 185, *note* 77: for petitions against the Irish Education Bill, see First Irish *Report* of 1835, Appendix, p. 76.

Page 142, *note* 48: see also Lord Gosford's evidence, Q. 3542.

Page 208, *note* 58: compare Qq. 3580-3581.

Page 218, Catholic clergy: see also Mr. Christie's evidence, Qq. 5651-5654.

Page 238-239, *note* 93: compare Lord Gosford's evidence, Irish *Report* of 1835, Qq. 3539-3540.

Page 250, *note* 26: see also *Edinburgh Review* for January 1850, p. 115, *note*.

Page 302, *note* 197: see also Qq. 6363-6369 and Appendix B3, pp. 28-30; *note* 198: see also Appendix B, Third Irish *Report*, pp. 28-29.

Page 307, *note* 216: for facts regarding the Annahagh outrage, see *Minutes of Evidence* of 1835, Qq. 3363-3474, 3521, 3526 *sqq.*, 4108, 4183, 4597.

Page 308, *note* 217, first line: add Q. 4224.

Page 311, *note* (Greer's dismissal): see Lord Caledon's evidence, Qq. 5422-5430.

Page 328, *note* 51 (the Castlewellan Bench): see also *Edinburgh Review*, January 1836, p. 107.

Page 382, *note* 81: see *Dublin University Magazine*, April, 1836, page 403. The Irish Grand Lodge "dissolved" April 13, 1836 (*ibid.*, June, 1836, pp. 687 *sqq.*).

Page 283, *note*: see *London and Westminster Review*, April to July, 1836, art. on "Orange conspiracy," pp. 181-201; cf. McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, art. "Orangemen."

Errata.

On checking the references for the fourth edition, I find that, in previous issues of the book, I inaccurately stated some of the *Question Numbers* of the *Minutes of Evidence* of the Irish *Reports* of 1835. This was chiefly due to the fact that the proof-sheets of the pages in question were corrected at a time when I had no access to my notes on the subject, or to the volumes of the *Reports* in the Melbourne Public Library.

H.W.C.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, LONDON, S.E.

CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES.

Price Id.; Yearly, 1s. 6d. post free.

CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES, which appears on the 15th of each month, is a concise record of current Catholic Literature and Art, and notices the principal works of Catholic interest as they appear. It gives special attention to CHURCH MUSIC, to the SACRED SCRIPTURES, and to the history of the LITURGY, and is the only English Catholic periodical which regularly devotes space to these subjects.

A special feature of CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES is the monthly list of new publications written by Catholics or dealing with subjects in which Catholics are specially interested.

CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES is sent post free to all members of the Catholic Truth Society, and is published by the ART AND BOOK COMPANY, 22 Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and Leamington; and by the CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, London, S.E.

CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES

HAS a guaranteed circulation of about **5000** monthly among a select clientèle of educated Catholics in Great Britain, the Colonies, and America, not easily reached by other means; hence it affords a peculiarly valuable medium for advertising.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements:

RATE PER INSERTION.	SINGLE.	SERIES OF SIX.	SERIES OF TWELVE
Whole Page $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.	40s.	35s.	30s.
Half-Page	21s.	18s. 6d.	16s.
Quarter-Page	11s.	10s.	9s.

SHORT PREPAID ADVERTISEMENTS.

Per Inch	6s.	5s. 6d.	5s.

WANTS AND EXCHANGES.

Advertisements from Priests and others (not Traders) wishing to dispose of Church Furniture, Books, or other articles, or desiring to procure such, may be inserted in the EXCHANGE COLUMN at 4d. per dozen words, prepaid.

Catholic Truth Society.

PRESIDENT:

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

HON. SECRETARIES:

JAMES BRITTEN, K.S.G., 126 Kennington Park Road, S.E.

REV. W. H. COLOGAN, Stock, Ingatestone.

TREASURER:

W. HOLLAND KING, Esq., 9 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION TEN SHILLINGS,

PAYABLE IN JANUARY.

LIFE SUBSCRIPTION TEN POUNDS.

The Subscription entitles Members to *Catholic Book Notes* monthly, and to admission to all the meetings held in connection with the Annual Conference; they also receive a discount of 25 per cent. on accounts amounting to over 5s. if paid within three months, while orders under that sum are sent to them post free. These privileges do not extend to those whose subscriptions are more than a year in arrear.

Subscribers of not less than One Guinea are entitled to receive, if they desire it, every publication of the Society priced at 6d. or under, issued during the year for which the subscription is paid. The existence and increase of the good work of the Society is dependent on the number of Members and *punctual* payment of subscriptions.

Donations, however small, will be gratefully received. Members wishing to collect small sums are requested to communicate with the Hon. Sec. Associates' Fund, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, S.E.

The Publications of the Catholic Truth Society are supplied on the following Terms:—

1. TO MEMBERS AND LOCAL BRANCHES: 25 per cent. allowed on Orders over Five Shillings; orders under Five Shillings sent carriage free. The carriage of orders on which Discount is allowed to be paid by Members.
2. TO NON MEMBERS: Orders over 5s. carriage free, when cost is remitted with order or on receipt of invoice.
3. TO THE TRADE:—25 per cent. allowed, calculated on the retail prices, and 13 as 12.

Letters relating to the Society should be addressed to THE HON. SECRETARIES 126 Kennington Park Road, S.E. *Orders* for books and *Cash* in payment of bills may be addressed to 126 Kennington Park Road, S.E., or to THE MANAGER, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, S.E. *Telegrams* ordering books should be addressed to THE MANAGER as above. TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "TRUISMATIC, LONDON." *Subscriptions* should be sent to THE TREASURER, 9 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C., or to THE MANAGER, as above.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

What is the Bible? By the Rev. W. H. Anderdon, S.J.
Confession to a Priest. By the same.
The True History of Maria Monk.
Monks and Nuns. By the Very Rev. Canon Foran.
Questions and Answers.
Mr. Collette as a Controversialist. By F. W. Lewis
Mr. Collette as a Historian. By the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.
Ellen Golding, the Rescued Nun. By the same.
Calumnies against Convents. By the same.
Does the Pope claim to be God? By the same.
The True Story of Barbara Ubryk. By the same.
Mr. Rider Haggard and the Myth of the Walled-up Nun. By the same.
Another Mexican Myth. By the same.
The Immuring of Nuns. By the Rev. H. Thurston, S.J.
Dean Farrar and the Pope's Letter. By the Rev. J. Gerard, S.J.
The Gunpowder Plot. By the same.
The Christian Priesthood. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.SS.R.
Tradition. By the same.
Ought we to honour Mary? By the Rev. J. F. Splaine, S.J.
The Alleged Failures of Infallibility. By the Rev. C. Coupe, S.J.
Rome and the Bible. By the Rev. T. Donnelly, S.J.
Sergeant Jones and his Talks about Confession. By the Rev. George Bampfield.
Cannot. By the same.
Chats with Deacon Douglas. By the same.
Confessio Viatoris. By C. Kegan Paul.
Protestant Fiction. By James Britten, K.S.G.
I.—Nuns and Convents. II.—Jesuits. III.—Priests.
IV.—The Laity. V.—Protestant Poets.
The above in one volume, cloth, 1s.
The Truth about Convents as told by Ex-nuns and others. By the same.
The Slatterys. By the same.
A Prominent Protestant (Mr. John Kensit). By the same.
The Methods of a Protestant Controversialist (the Rev. Dr. Horton). By the same.
Persecution. By the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.
The Relics of the True Cross. By the Right Rev. Bishop Bellord.
Carpenter Lynes, or, The Mother and the Son: Talks about Our Lady. By the Rev. G. Bampfield. In two parts, 1d. each.
Why in Latin? By the same.
The Hungarian Confession of Faith. By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.
Bessie's Black Puddings; or, the Bible only. By the Rev. F. M. de Zulueta
"I Go Straight to Christ." By the same.
What is "Benediction?" By the same.
The "Iron Virgin" of Nuremberg. By the Rev. H. Lucas, S.J.
The Art of Lying, as practised by some anti-Catholic Tract-writers. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.SS.R.
Celibacy. By C. Kegan Paul.

ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY.

A Voice from the Dead; Being a letter to an Anglican Friend, by the Cou t de Montalembert.
The Continuity of the English Church. By the Very Rev. Canon Croft.
The Popes and the English Church. By the Rev. W. Waterworth.
The Sacrifices of Masses.
Was St. Aidan an Anglican? By the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.
How "the Church of England washed her Face." By the same.
Was Barlow a Bishop? By Serjeant Bellasis.
189: or, the Church of Old England protests. By the Rev. J. D. Breen, O.S.B.
The Old Religion in England. By Rev. P. Lynch.
The Doctrine of Intention. By the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.
St. Irenæus on the Church, etc. By C. F. B. Allnatt.
Points of Anglican Controversy.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY—*continued.*

Continuity Reconsidered. By J. H. Matthews.
How I came Home. By Lady Herbert.
Why I left the Church of England. By James Britten, K.S.G.
Church Defence—First Series.
Church Defence—Second Series.
Church Defence—Third Series.
St. Peter's Primacy and the Royal Supremacy. By T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G.
The Conversion of Cardinal Newman. By the Rev. Dr. Rivington.
No Sacrifice, no Priest: or why Anglican Orders were condemned. By the Rev. A. S. Barnes.
Why I became a Catholic. By Horace E. Chapman, M.A.
The Anglican Archbishops and the Pope. By Cardinal Vaughan.
Tekel: or, the Anglican Archbishops arraigned. By the Rev. Dr. Rivington.
Episcopal Jurisdiction in Bristol. By the Bishop of Clifton.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

Christian Aspects of the Labour Question. By the Rt. Rev. Abbot Snow, O.S.B.
Leo XIII. on Labour. By Cardinal Manning.
Our National Vice. By Cardinal Manning.
Catholic Temperance Leaflets (8 in wrapper).
Total Abstinence from a Catholic point of view. By the Rev. W. H. Cologan.
A Temperance Catechism. By a Priest.
Woman's Work in the African Missions. By Miss Renouf.
The African Slave Trade. By Lady Herbert.
Our Responsibility for Intemperance. By the Bishop of Newport.
The Drunkard. By Archbishop Ullathorne.
Mixed Marriages. By the Bishop of Leeds.
Mixed Marriages. By the Rev. G. Bampfield.
An Enemy of the Race. By Sir Andrew Clark.

HISTORICAL SERIES.

Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.
The Ancient English Church and the Holy Eucharist. By the Very Rev. Provost Northcote.
The Faith of the Ancient English Church concerning the Blessed Virgin. By the same.
The Church Catholic. By B. F. C. Costelloe.
The Church and the Catacombs. By the same.
The Mass. By the same.
The Teaching of the Twelve. By the same.
Before and after the Reformation.
Before and after Gunpowder Plot. By E. Healy Thompson.
Blessed Peter and the English People. By Cardinal Vaughan.
The First Experiment in Civil and Religious Liberty. By James Carmont.
St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572. By the Rev. William Loughnan, S.J. 1d.
The Catholic Church. By the Rev. Dr. Gildea.
The False Decretals. By Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J.
The Huguenots. By the Rev. W. Loughnan, S.J.
The Gordon Riots. By Lionel Johnson, B.A.
Dean Farrar and the Observance of Good Friday. By the Rev. H. Thurston, S.J.
England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett.
England's Dedication and the Angelus. By the same.
The Spanish Inquisition. By Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.
The Book of Common Prayer and the Mass. By the Rev. R. C. Laing.
The Lay Folk's Mass Book.
England and the Holy Eucharist. By the Very Rev. Canon Connelly.
England and Devotion to the Blessed Virgin. By the same.
The Coming of St. Augustine. By Ven. Bede.
The Mission of St. Augustine. By Dom Aidan Gasquet, O.S.B.
The Landing of St. Augustine. By the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.
The Reformation at St. Martin's, Leicester. By Dudley Baxter, B.A.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

A Bible Picture Book for Catholic Children. By Lady Amabel Kerr. Cloth; gilt, 3s. ; paper, 2s.

Before our Lord Came. Stories from the Old Testament. By Lady Amabel Kerr. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Holy Gospel according to St. Luke. With Introduction and Notes by the Right Rev. Mgr. Ward. Three Maps. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

————The same, abridged, for Schools and Classes. Cloth, 1s.

————The same, text, with a few notes, 2d.

The Eucharistic Month of Holy Scripture. By the Right Rev. Bishop Bellord. Printed in red and black. Leather, 1s. 6d. Boards, 1s.

The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. With Introduction and Notes by R. D. Byles, B.A. Cloth, 1s.

The New Testament. Limp Cloth, 6d.

The Gospels and Epistles of St. John. With Preface by Cardinal Manning. Cloth, 6d. ; paper, 3d.

The Pope and the Bible. By the Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J. 6d.

The Life and Writings of St. Peter. 4d.

Scripture Readings: being the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Feasts. 3d.

The Bible and the Reformation. By C. F. B. Allnatt. 2d.

The Passion of our Lord in the Words of the Gospels. 1d.

The Gospel of St. Matthew. 1d.

A Scriptural Life of the Blessed Virgin. 1d.

St. Mary Magdalene and other Women of the New Testament. 1d.

What is the Bible? By the Rev. W. H. Anderdon, S.J. 1d.

Rome and the Bible. By the Rev. T. Donnelly, S.J. 1d.

The Holy Rosary in the New Testament. 1d.

What does the Bible say? (Leaflet.) 1s. per 100.

The Catholic Church in the Scriptures. By the Bishop of Nottingham.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT AND THE MASS.

To Calvary through the Mass. By the Rev. Eric W. Leslie, S.J. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

The Eucharistic Month of Holy Scripture. By the Right Rev. Bishop Bellord. Printed in red and black. Leather, 1s. 6d. ; boards, 1s.

The Weekly Communicant. By the Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J. Cloth, 6d. ; or in two parts, 1d. each.

Visits to Jesus in the Tabernacle. 4d.

A Way of Assisting at Holy Mass. Cloth, 4d. ; paper, 1d.

Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. Cloth, 4d. ; wrapper, 2d.

A Book of the Mass. Cloth, 4d. ; paper 1d.

Explanation of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Mass. 3d.

Instructions for First Communion. By the Rev. H. Gibson. 3d.

The Ancient English Church and the Holy Eucharist. By the Very Rev. Provost Northcote. 1d.

The Mass. By B. F. C. Costelloe. 1d.

The Lay Folk's Mass Book. 1d.

England and the Holy Eucharist. By the Right Rev. Mgr. Canon Connelly. 1d.

Counsels on Holy Communion. By the same. 1d. net.

Prayers from the Sarum Missal. 1d.

Before the Tabernacle. 1d.

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. By the Rev. G. Bampfield. 1d.

What is Benediction. By the Rev. F. M. de Zulueta, S.J. 1d.

A complete List of Publications and all information may be obtained on application to THE MANAGER.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

10,666 363.416 C42

Cleary, H. W.

AUTHOR

The Orange Society

TITLE

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

LIBRARY